Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE

DISTINCTIO XV.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 255-258.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Pars. I.

Cap. I.

Quod Spiritus sanctus a se ipso datur, et Filius a se ipso mittitur.

Hic considerandum est, cum Spiritus sanctus detur hominibus a Patre et Filio, quod est ipsum temporaliter procedere ab utroque vel mitti, utrum etiam a se ipso detur. Si datur a se, et procedit vel mittitur a se. Ad quod dicimus, quia Spiritus sanctus et Deus est et donum sive datum: et ideo[1] dat et datur. Dat quidem in quantum Deus, et datur in quantum donum. Cum autem donatio sive datio Spiritus sancti sit operatio Dei et communis sit et indivisa operatio trium personarum, donatur[2] itaque Spiritus sanctus non tantum a Patre et Filio, sed etiam a se ipso. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[3] dicit, quod se ipsum dat. « Sicut, inquit, corpus carnis nihil est aliud quam caro, sic donum Spiritus sancti nihil est aliud quam Spiritus sanctus. In tantum ergo donum Dei est, in quantum datur eis quibus datur. Apud se autem Deus est, etsi nemini datur, quia Deus erat Patri et Filio coaeternus, antequam cuiquam daretur. Nec quia illi dant et ipse datur, ideo minor est illis. Ita enim datur, sicut Dei donum, ut etiam se ipsum det, sicut Deus. Non enim dici potest, non esse suae potestatis, de quo dictum est:[4] *Spiritus ubi vult spirat* ». Ecce aperte dicit, quod Spiritus sanctus se ipsum dat. Si enim Spiritus sanctus se ipsum dare non potest, et eum Pater dare potest et Filius, potest

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD

DISTINCTION 15

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 255-258.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Part I

Chapter I

That the Holy Spirit is given by Himself, and the Son is sent by Himself.

Here there must be considered, since the Holy Spirit is given to men by the Father and the Son, because it is that He temporally proceeds from Each and/or is sent, whether He also is given by Himself. If He is given by Himself, He also proceeds and/or is sent by Himself. To which we say, that the Holy Spirit both is God and a gift or a given: and for that reason He[1] gives and is given. Indeed, He gives inasmuch as God, as is given inasmuch as gift. Moreover, since the donation or giving of the Holy Spirit is an operation of God and is a common and undivided operation of the Three Persons, thus also the Holy Spirit is not only granted [donatur][2] by the Father and the Son, but also by Himself. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book On the Trinity says,[3] that He gives Himself. « Just as », he says, « the body of flesh is nothing other than flesh, so the gift of the Holy Spirit is nothing other than the Holy Spirit. Inasmuch, therefore, as He is the gift of God, so much is he given to those to whom He is given. On the other hand, in His own [apud se] He is God, even if He is given to no one, because He was God, coeternal to the Father and the son, before He was given to anyone. And not because They given and He is given, for that reason is He less than They. For thus is He given, as the gift of

itaque[5] Pater dare aliquid et Filius, quod non potest Spiritus sanctus. Item, si Pater et Filius dant Spiritum sanctum, nec ipse dat: aliquid ergo Pater operatur et Filius, quod non operatur Spiritus sanctus. Dat ergo Spiritus sanctus se ipsum. Si autem se ipsum dat, tunc et[6] a se ipso procedit et mittitur; quod utique verum est. Nam processio temporalis Spiritus sancti vel missio ipsius est donatio, et ipsa est Dei operatio. Procedit ergo Spiritus sanctus temporaliter a se et mittitur a se, quia datur a se.

God, so that He also gives Himself, as God. For it cannot be said, that it does not belong to His power, concerning which it has been said:[4] *The Spirit breathes where He wills* ». Behold he openly says, that the Holy Spirit gives Himself. For if the Holy Spirit cannot give Himself, and the Father can give Him and the Son (likewise), thus also[5] the Father can give something and the Son (likewise), which the Holy Spirit cannot. Likewise, if the Father and the Son give the Holy Spirit, and He does not give (Himself): therefore the Father works something and the Son (likewise), which the Holy Spirit does not work. Therefore the Holy Spirit does give Himself. But if He gives Himself, then also[6] He proceeds from Himself and is given (by Himself), which is indeed true. For the temporal procession and/or mission of the Holy Spirit is the donation of the Same, and is itself an operation of God. Therefore the Holy Spirit proceeds temporally from Himself and is sent by Himself, because He is given by Himself.

Ne autem mireris, quod Spiritus sanctus dicitur mitti vel procedere a se. Nam et de Filio Dei dicit Augustinus in secundo libro de Trinitate,[7] quod non tantum a Patre missus est, sed etiam a se ipso et a Spiritu sancto, quaerens, quo modo Filius vel Spiritus sanctus sit missus, cum uterque sit ubique tanquam Deus. Nam uterque, inquit Augustinus, legitur missus. De Spiritu enim sancto legitur:[8] *Quem mittet Pater in nomine meo*. Et iterum: *Si abiero, mittam eum ad vos*. Et Filius de se dicit: *Exivi a Patre et veni in mundum*. Et Apostolos dicit:[9] *Misit Deus Filium suum*. In Propheta autem scriptum est ex persona Dei: *Caelum et terram ego impleo*. Itaque ubique Deus est, ubique ergo est Filius, ubique etiam est Spiritus sanctus. Illuc ergo missus est Filius et Spiritus sanctus, ubi erant.

But do not wonder, that the Holy Spirit is said to be sent and/or to proceed from Himself. For of the Son of God even (St.) Augustine says in the second book On the Trinity,[7] that He has been sent not only by the Father, but also by Himself and by the Holy Spirit, asking, in what manner the Son and/or the Holy Spirit has been sent, since Each is everywhere as God. For Each, says (St.) Augustine, is read (to have been) sent. For of the Holy Spirit there is read:[8] *Whom the Father will send in My Name*. And again: *If I go away, I shall send Him to you*. And the Son says of Himself: *I have gone forth from the Father and have come into the world*. And the Apostle says:[9] *God sent His own Son*. Moreover in the Prophet there has been written in the person of God: *Heaven and Earth do I fill*. And so God is everywhere, therefore the Son is everywhere, (and) the Holy Spirit is also everywhere. Therefore the Son has been sent and the Holy Spirit (likewise) to that (place), where They (already) were.

Cap. II.

Quomodo intelligenda sit missio utriusque.

Chapter II

In what manner is the mission of Each to be understood.

« Quocirca quaerendum est, quomodo intelligatur missio Filii vel Spiritu sancti. Pater enim solus, inquit Augustinus in

« About which there must be asked, in what manner is the mission of the Son and/or of the Holy Spirit understood. For the Father

eodem,[10] nusquam legitur missus », . . .

alone », says (St.) Augustine in the same (book),[10] « is never read (to have been) sent », . . .

---

[1] Codd. A B C E addunt *et*. Paulo post Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 9 addiiciunt *sive datum* post *donum*.
[2] Vat. et ed. 8 *datur*. Immediate post cod. D *utique* pro *itaque*.
[3] Cap. 19. n. 36.
[4] Ioan. 3, 8.
[5] Vat. et edd. 3, 4, 6, 8 cum cod. D *utique*; cod. A *igitur*; cod C *et itaque*; codd. B E et edd. *itaque*. Statim edd. 1, 2, 7, 8 omittunt *dare* post *Pater*.
[6] Vat. et edd. 2, 5, 9 cum cod. D omittunt *et*. In sequenti propositione post *ipsa* Vat. cum aliis edd., excepta 6, omittit *est*, contradicentibus omnibus codd.
[7] Cap. 5. n. 7; sed Magister diffusam doctrinam S. Augustini valde contrahit, verba transponit et de suo addit. — Paulo ante post *Filio* Vat. cum pluribus edd. omittit *Dei*.
[8] Ioan. 14, 26; postea ibid. 16, 7. Vulgata: *Si autem abiero*; ed. 1: *Et ita: si abiero*; ed. 8: *Et si abiero* omittendo *iterum*. — Deinde ibid. v. 28.
[9] Gal. 4, 4. — Deinde Ierem. 23, 24. Vulgata: *Nunquid non caelum et terram ego impleo, dicit Dominus?* — Edd. 1, 8, pro *scriptum* habent *dictum est*. Mox Vat. et edd. 5, 6, 9 addunt *si* post *Itaque*.
[10] Loc. cit. n. 8, ubi etiam quae sequuntur. — Paulo ante edd. 5, 9 praemittunt *ut* ante *inquit*.

[1] Codices A B C E add *both* [et]. A little after this the Vatican edition and editions 4, 5, 6, and 9, add *or given* [sive datum] after *gift* [donum].
[2] The Vatican edition and edition 8 have *is given* [datur]. Immediately after this [in the English text, a little before this] codex D has *indeed* [utique] for *thus also* [itaque].
[3] Chapter 19, n.36.
[4] John 3:8.
[5] The Vatican edition and editions 3, 4, 6 and 8, together with codices D, have *indeed* [utique] for *thus also* [itaque]. Immediately after this editions 1, 2, 7, and 8 omit *give* [dare] after *the Father* [Pater].
[6] The Vatican edition and editions 2, 5, and 9, together with codex D, omits *also* [et]. In the following proposition at *itself* [ipsa] the Vatican edition together with the other editions, except edition 6, omit *is* [est], contrary to all the other codices.
[7] Chapter 5, n. 7; but Mater (Peter) contracts the popularly known teaching of St. Augustine, transposes words and adds from his own. — A little before this after *the Son* [Filio] the Vatican edition, together with very many editions, omits *of God* [Dei].
[8] John 14:26; the one after this is John 16:7. The Vulgate reads *But if I go away* [Si autem abiero]; edition 1 has: *And thus: if I go away* [Et ita: si abiero]; edition 8: *And if I go away* [Et si abiero], omitting *again* [iterum]. — The next quote is John 16:28.
[9] Gal. 4:4. — Then Jer. 23:24. The Vulgate reads: *"Do I not fill Heaven and Earth?", says the Lord*. — Editions 1 and 8 have *there has been said* [dictum est] for *written* [scriptum]. Then the Vatican edition and editions 5, 6, and 9, add *if* [si] after *And so* [Itaque].
[10] Loc. cit., n. 8, and those which follow. — A little before this editions 5 and 9, prefix *as* [ut] to *says* [inquit].

---

p. 256

sed Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Et de Filio primum videamus, quomodo missus? « Apostolus dicit:[1] *Misit Deus Filium suum factum ex muliere*, ubi satis ostendit, eo ipso missum Filium, quo factum ex muliere. Proinde mitti a Patri sine Spiritu sancto non potuit, quia Pater intelligitur misisse eum, cum fecit ex femina; quod utique non fecit sine Spiritu sancto ». Ecce hic dicit, Filium missum a Patre et Spiritu sancto.

but the Son and the Holy Spirit (are). And of the Son let us see first of all, in what manner (has He been) sent? « The Apostle says:[1] *God sent His own Son wrought out of a woman*, where he sufficiently shows, the Son (was) sent for the very reason, that (He was) wrought out of a woman. Next, He could not be sent by the Father without the Holy Spirit, because the Father is understood to have sent Him, when He wrought (Him) out of a female; which indeed He did not do without the Holy Spirit ». Behold here he says, that the Son (was) sent by the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Cap. III.

Quod a Spiritu sancto etiam Filius sit missus.

Et quod a Spiritu sancto Filius sit missus, ut ait Augustinus in eodem,[2] auctoritatibus confirmatur. Ipse Christus dicit per Isaiam: *Nunc misit me Dominus et Spiritus eius*. De hoc Ambrosius in libro tertio de Spiritu sancto[3] ita ait: « Quis est, qui dicit: *Misit me Dominus et Spiritus eius*, nisi qui venit a Patre, ut salvos faceret peccatores », id est Christus? « ergo et Pater Filium missit et Spiritus sanctus ». Idem in eodem: « Datus est a Patre, ut Isaias dicit:[4] *Puer natus est nobis, et Filius datus est nobis*. Datus est, audeo dicere, et a Spiritu, quia et a Spiritu missus est ». « Dicit enim Filius Dei:[5] *Spiritus Domini super me, propter quod unxit me: evangelizare pauperibus misit me, praedicare captivis remissionem* etc. Quod cum de libro Isaiae legeret, ait in Evangelio: *Hodie completa est haec Scriptura in auribus vestris*, ut de se dictum esse significaret. Bene autem dixit, *super me*; quia quasi filius hominis et unctus est et missus ad praedicandum. Nam secundum divinitatem non super Christum est Spiritus, sed in Christo ». Ecce his verbis ostendit Ambrosius, Filium esse missum et datum nobis non tantum a Patre, sed etiam a Spiritu sancto.

Chapter III

That the Son has also been sent by the Holy Spirit.

And that the Son has been sent by the Holy Spirit, as (St.) Augustine says in the same (book),[2] is confirmed by authorities. Christ Himself says through Isaiah: *Now He has sent Me, the Lord and His Spirit*. Of this (St.) Ambrose in the third book On the Holy Spirit[3] says thus: « Who is the one who says: *He has sent Me, the Lord and His Spirit*, except the One who comes from the Father, to save sinners », that is Christ? « therefore both the Father and the Holy Spirit sent the Son ». The same (is said) in the same (book): « He has been given by the Father, as Isaiah says:[4] *A boy has been born for us, and the Son has been given to us*. He is given, I dare say, also by the Spirit, because He has also been sent by the Spirit ». « For the Son of God says:[5] *The Spirit of the Lord (is) upon me, on account of which He has anointed Me: to evangelize the poor He sent me, to preach remission to captives* etc.. Which, when He read from the book of Isaiah, He said in the Gospel: *Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your ears*, to signify that it has been said of Himself. Moreover, He said well, *upon Me*; because as the Son of Man He has been both anointed and sent to preach. For according to the Divinity the Spirit is not above Christ, but in Christ ». Behold with these words (St.) Ambrose shows, that the Son has been sent and given to us not only by the Father, but also by the Holy Spirit.

Cap. IV.

Quod Filius etiam sit datus a se ipso.

Deinde ostendit, esse datum etiam a se ipso, ita dicens in eodem libro:[6] « Cum non definitum fuerit per Prophetam, a quo datus sit Filius, ostenditur datus gratia Trinitatis, ut etiam ipse Filius se dederit ». Ecce hic dicit, quod Filius se dedit, quia Trinitas[7] eum dedit. Si autem Filius a se datus est, a se ergo missus est et a se processit. Et hoc utique verum est et concedi oportet, cum eius missio sit divina operatio.

Chapter IV

That the Son has also been given by Himself.

Then he shows, that He has also been given by Himself, saying thus in the same book:[6] « Since it was not defined through the Prophet, from whom the Son is given, it is shown, (that when He is) given by the grace of the Trinity, that the Son Himself also gave Himself ». Behold here he says, that the Son gave Himself, because the Trinity[7] gave Him. But if the Son has been given by Himself, therefore He has been sent by Himself and proceeded from Himself. And this indeed is true and is bound [oportet] to be conceded, since His mission is a divine

Quod autem a se mittatur Augustinus astruit in libro secundo de Trinitate dicens:[8] « Forte aliquis cogat, ut dicamus, etiam a se ipso missum esse Filium; quia Mariae conceptus et partus operatio Trinitatis est. Sed, inquit aliquis, quomodo Pater eum misit, si ipse se misit? Cui respondeo quaerens, ut dicat, quomodo eum Pater sanctificavit, si ipse se sanctificavit? Utrumque enim Dominus ait:[9] *Quem Pater*, inquit, *sanctificavit et misit in hunc mundum*. Et alibi: *Ego pro eis sanctifico me ipsum*. Item quaero, quomodo Pater eum tradidit, si ipse se tradidit? Utrumque enim legitur.[10] Credo, respondebit, si probe sapit, quia una voluntas est Patris et Filii et inseparabilis operatio. Sic ergo intelligat, illam incarnationem et ex Virgine nativitatem, in qua Filius intelligitur missus, una eademque operatione Patris et Filii inseparabiliter esse factam, non inde separato Spiritu sancto. Ergo a Patre et Filio missus est idem Filius, quia a Patre et[11] Verbo eius factum est, ut mitteretur, id est, incarnatus hominibus appareret. Non enim missus est mutando locum, quia in mundo erat. Quapropter Pater invisibilis una cum Filio secum invisibili, eundem Filium visibilem faciendo, misisse eum dictus est: qui si ita visibilis fieret, ut cum Patre invisibilis esse desisteret, id est, si substantia[12] invisbilis Verbi in creaturam visibilem mutata et transiens verteretur, ita missus a Patre intelligeretur Filius, ut tantum missus, non etiam cum Patre mittens inveniretur. Cum vero sic accepta est *forma servi*, ut maneret incommutabilis *forma Dei*,[13] manifestum est, quod a Patre et Filio non apparentibus factum sit, quod appareret in Filio, id est, ab invisibili Patre cum invisibili Filio idem ipse Filius visibilis mitteretur ».

operation.

Moreover, that He is sent by Himself (St.) Augustine adds [astruit] in the second book On the Trinity, saying:[8] « Perchance someone thinks, that we are saying, that the Son has also been sent by Himself; because (His) conceiving and being-born from Mary is an operation of the Trinity? But, does anyone say, in what manner the Father sent Him, if He sent Himself? To which I respond asking, granted that he says (this), in what manner did the Father sanctify Him, if He sanctified Himself? For each did the Lord say:[9] *Whom the Father*, He says, *sanctified and sent into this world*. And elsewhere: *I sanctify Myself on their behalf*. Likewise I ask, in what manner did the Father hand Him over, if He handed Himself over? For each is read.[10] I believe, he shall respond, if one knows rightly, that there is one Will of the Father and of the Son, and an inseparable operation. Therefore let him understand in this manner, that that Incarnation and Nativity from the Virgin, in which the Son is understood (to have been) sent, has been wrought by one and the same operation of the Father and the Son, not with the Holy Spirit separated from it. Therefore the same Son has been sent by the Father and the Son, because it has been wrought by the Father and[11] His Word, that He was sent, that is, that He appeared Incarnate to men. For He was not sent by changing place, because He was in the world. Wherefore the invisible Father, one with the Son invisible with Himself, by making the same Son visible, is said to have sent Him: who if He became visible thus, that He would cease to be invisible with the Father, that is, if the invisible Substance[12] of the Word, having been changed and passing over, was turned into a visible creature, such that the Son would be understood (to have been) sent by the Father, as only One sent, He would not also be found (to be) sending (Himself) with the Father. On the other hand, since in this manner (the Substance) was accepted *in the form of a servant*, though It remained the incommutable *form of God*,[13] it is manifest, that it has been wrought by the Father and the Son, not by appearances, that It appeared in the Son (Incarnate), that is,

(that) the same Son, Himself (now) visible, was sent by the invisible Father with the invisible Son ».

Ex praedictis aperte monstratur, quod Filius missus est a Patre et a[14] Spiritu sancto et a se ipso, et quae sit ipsa missio, scilicet incarnatio, id est, quod factus est homo, per quod visibilis apparuit, quod est opus commune Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti.

From the aforesaid it is openly demonstrated, that the Son has been sent by the Father and by[14] the Holy Spirit and by Himself, and what is the mission itself, namely, the Incarnation, that is, that He has been made Man, through which He appeared visible, which is a common work of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

---

[1] Gal. 4, 4. — Paulo ante Vat. contra codd. A B C D et edd. 1, 8 *primo* pro *primum*, et immediate post cum omnibus edd., excepta 3, mutata interpunctione, male legit: *missum eum Apostolus dicat*.
[2] Loc. cit. n. 8, secundum sensum. — Locus Isaiae est 18, 16. Vulgata: *Nunc Dominus Deus misit me* etc.
[3] Cap. 1. n. 7. et 8. — Secundus locus ibid. c. 2. n. 9; tertius a verbis: *Dicit enim* sumtus est passim ibid. c. 1. n. 1. 2. 6.
[4] Isai. 9. 6. Vulgata: *Parvulus enim natus* etc.
[5] Luc. 4, 18, ubi Christus in synagoga legit verba Isaiae 61, 1-2. et deinde v. 21. dicit: *Quia hodie impleta est*. etc. — Mox pro *significaret* Vat. cum plerisque edd. *signaret*, sed contradicentibus codd. A C D et edd. 1, 8.
[6] Cap. 2. n. 9. — In principio huius loci post *Cum* Vat. et edd. 4, 6, 8, 9 addunt *enim*. Mox post *a quo datus* loco *est* posuimus *sit* auctoritate omnium codd. et edd. 1, 5, 6, 8.
[7] Cod. D praemittit *tota*; ed. 1 adiungit *aeque*.
[8] Cap. 5. n. 9. — In hoc textu pro *cogat* ed. 6 *rogat*: et edd. 8, 9 *cogitat*. — Ante *Mariae* Vat. et pleraeque edd. addunt *et* contra codd. et ed. 1, 6; Augustinus *ille* pro *et*. — Paulo infra ante *ipse se sanctificavit* item removimus *et* auctoritate codd. et edd. 1, 6, 8.
[9] Ioan. 10, 36, ubi Vulgata omittit *hunc* ante *mundum*. — Secundus locus est Ioan. 17, 19.
[10] Rom. 8, 32, et Gal. 2, 20. — Mox pleraeque edd. post *Credo* adiiciunt *quod*.
[11] Codd. A B et edd. 1, 8 repetunt *a*.
[12] Solummodo Vat. et edd. 4, 8, 9 male praemittunt *in*, legendo: *in substantia*.
[13] Respicitur Phil. 2, 6. 7.
[14] Vat. et ed. 6 omittunt *a*; paulo ante edd. 1, 8 *supra dictis* loco *praedictis*.

---

[1] Gal. 4:4. — A little before this the Vatican edition, contrary to codices A B C D and editions 1 and 8, has *first* [primo] for *first of all* [primum], and immediately after this together with all the editions, except edition 3, having changed the punctuation, reads badly: *Let the Apostle say that He (was) sent* [missum eum Apostolus dicat].
[2] Loc. cit., n. 8, according to its sense. — The passage from Isaiah is 18:16. The Vulgate reads: *Now the Lord God has sent me* etc.[Nunc Dominus Deus misit me etc.].
[3] Chapter 1, nn. 7 and 8. — The following passage is ibid, ch. 2, n. 9; the third from the words *For the Son of God says* etc. [Dicit enim etc.] is ibid., ch. 1, nn. 1, 2 and 6 passim.
[4] Isaiah 9:6. The Vulgate reads: *For a little child is born* etc. [Parvulus enim natus etc.].
[5] Lk. 4:18, where Christ in the synagogue reads the words of Isaiah 61:1-2, and after v. 21 says: *Because today this Scripture is fulfilled* etc..[Quia hodie impleta est etc.]. — Then in place of *signify* [significaret] the Vatican edition together with very many editions has *mark* [signaret], but contradicting codices A C D and editions 1 and 8.
[6] Chapter 2, n. 9. — At the beginning of this passage, the Vatican edition and editions 4, 6, 8 and 9, add *For* [enim: after cum in the Latin text]. Then after *from whom* [a quo datus] we have changed the verb to the subjunctive on the authority of all the codices and editions 1, 5, 6 and 8 [as required by Latin grammar for this kind of subordinate clause.]
[7] Codex D prefixes to this *whole* [total]; edition 1 adds *equally* [aeque].
[8] Chapter 5, n. 9. — In this text in place of *thinks* [cogat] edition 6 has *asks* [rogat]; and editions 8 and 9 have *thinks* [cogitat]. — Next, the Vatican edition and very many editions by adding *and* [et] before *Mary* [Mariae], contrary to the codices and to editions 1 and 6, [read: *. . . and being-born and Mary's*]; (St.) Augustine wrote *that conceiving etc.* [ille conceptus etc.]. A little below this before *He sanctified Himself* [ipse se sanctificavit] we have likewise removed *also* [et] on the authority of the codices and editions 1, 6 and 8.
[9] John 10:36, where the Vulgate omits the *this* [hunc] before *world* [mundum]. — The second passage is John 17:19.
[10] Rom. 8:32, and Gal. 2:20. — Then very many editions after *I believe* [Credo] add *that* [quod].

[11] Codices A and B and editions 1 and 8 repeat *by* [a].
[12] Only the Vatican edition and editions 4, 8 and 9 badly prefix an *in*, by reading: *in the invisible Substance* [in substantia etc.].
[13] A reference to Phil. 2:6,7.
[14] The Vatican edition and edition 6 omit *by* [a]; a little before this editions 1 and 8 have *above said* [supra dictis] in place of *aforesaid* [praedictis].

---

p. 257

Cap. V.

Quomodo intelligendum sit illud: a me ipso non veni.

Sed ad hoc opponitur: si Filius a se ipso missus est, cur ergo ait:[1] *A me ipso non veni*? Ad hoc Augustinus respondet in secundo libro de Trinitate[2] dicens: « Hoc dictum esse secundum formam servi, secundum quam non fecit, ut mitteretur », id est, non est operatus incarnationem, sed secundum formam Dei.

Chapter V

In what manner this must be understood: I have not come on My own.

But to this there is opposed: 'if the Son has been sent by Himself, why, therefore, does He say:[1] *I have not come on My own*?' To this (St.) Augustine responds in the second book On the Trinity,[2] saying: « That this has been said according to the form of a servant, according to which He did not cause, that He was sent », that is, He did not work the Incarnation, but according to the form of God (He did).

Pars. II.

Cap. VI.

Utrum semel tantum sit missus Filius, an saepe.

Hic quaeritur, utrum semel tantum missus sit Filius, an saepe mittatur. Si enim missio Filii ipsius tantum incarnatio est, cum semel tantum incarnatus sit, et semel tantum videtur missus. At si saepe mittitur, est et alia eius missio quam incarnatio. Sed quae est illa? Nunquid aeterna genitura missio eius dicenda est, an etiam alia missio[3] quaerenda est?

Part II

Chapter VI

Whether the Son has been sent only once, or often.

Here there is asked, whether the Son has been sent only once, or whether He is sent often. For if the mission of the Son Himself is only the Incarnation, since He has been incarnated only once, He seems also (to have been) sent only once. Or if He is sent often, there is also a mission of His other than the Incarnation. But what is that? Must the eternal begetting [genitura] be said (to be) His mission, or is another mission[3] also to be sought?

Cap. VII.

De duobus modis missionis Filii.

Ad quod dicimus, quod duobus modis dicitur Filius mitti[4] praeter illam aeternam genituram, quae ineffabilis est, secundum quam etiam missus posset dici, ut videtur quibusdam, sed melius ac verius secundum eam dicitur genitus. Praeter eam igitur duobus modis dicitur mitti, scilicet vel cum visibiliter mundo apparuit carne indutus, vel

Chapter VII

On the two manners of the Son's mission.

To which we say, that the Son is said to be sent[4] in two manners, besides that eternal begetting, which is ineffable, according to which He could also be said (to have been) sent, as seems to certain ones, but better and more truly is said (to have been) begotten according to that one. Besides that one, therefore, He is said to be sent in

cum *se in animas pias sic transfert*,[5] ut ab eis percipiatur ac cognoscatur. Hos duos missionis modos Augustinus aperte distinguit in quarto libro de Trinitate[6] dicens: « Non eo ipso quod de Patre natus est, missus dicitur Filius, sed vel eo quod apparuit huic mundo Verbum caro factum; unde dicit:[7] *A Patre exivi et veni in mundum*; vel eo quod ex tempore cuiusquam mente percipitur, sicut dictum est de Sapientia:[8] *Emitte illam de caelis sanctis tuis et a sede magnitudinis tuae, ut mecum sit et mecum laboret*, id est, doceat me laborare. Et tunc unicuique mittitur, cum a quoquam cognoscitur atque percipitur, quantum cognosci et percipi potest pro captu vel proficientis in Deum, vel perfectae in Deo animae rationalis ».

two manners, namely when He appeared visibly to the world as one clothed in flesh, and/or when *He transfers Himself thus into pious souls*,[5] so that He be perceived and cognized by them. These two manners of mission (St.) Augustine openly distinguishes in the fourth book On the Trinity,[6] saying: « Not for the very reason that He has been born from the Father, is the Son said (to be) sent, but either for the reason that He appeared to this world as the Word made flesh; whence He says:[7] *I have gone forth from the Father and have come into the world*, and/or for the reason that He is perceived in time by the mind of everyone [cuiusquam], just as has been said of Wisdom:[8] *Send Her forth from Thy holy heavens and from the throne of Thy Majesty, so that She might be with me and work with me*, that is, teach me to work. And then He is sent to each one, when He is cognized and perceived by anyone, as much as He can be cognized and perceived by the comprehension [pro captu] of one making his way [proficientis] unto God, and/or of the rational soul perfected in God ».

Cap. VIII.

Quod secundum alterum modum semel sit missus, secundum alterum saepe; et secundum alterum modum dicitur missus in mundum, secundum alterum non.

Ecce distincti sunt duo modi missionis Filii,[9] et secundum alterum semel tantum missus est Dei Filius, secundum alterum saepe missus est et mittitur quotidie. Nam secundum alterum missus est, ut sit homo, quod semel tantum factum est; secundum alterum vero mittitur, ut sit cum homine, quo modo[10] quotidie mittitur ad Sanctos et missus est etiam ante incarnationem et ad omnes Sanctos, qui ante fuerunt, et etiam ad Angelos. Unde Augustinus de Filio, id est de Sapientia Patris loquens in quarto libro de Trinitate[11] ait: « Aliter mittitur Sapientia, ut sit cum homine; aliter missa est, ut sit homo. *In animas enim sanctas se trasfert, et amicos Dei et Prophetas constituit*; sicut etiam implet sanctos Angelos. Sed cum venit plenitudo temporis, missa est, non ut impleret Angelos nec ut esset Angelus nec ut esset cum hominibus vel in hominibus,[12] ut antea in Patribus erat et in Prophetis, sed

Chapter VIII

That according to one manner He has been sent once, according to the other often; and according to one manner He is said (to have been) sent into the world, according to the other (He is) not.

Behold, the two manners of the mission of the Son[9] have been distinguished, and according to one the Son of God has been sent only once, according to the other He has been sent often and is sent daily. For according to one He has been sent, to be a Man, which only happened once; but, according to the other He is sent, to be with man, in the manner[10] in which He is daily sent to the Saints and Has been sent even before the Incarnation and to all Saints, who were before, and even to the Angels. Whence (St.) Augustine speaking of the Son, that is of the Wisdom of the Father, in the fourth book On the Trinity[11] says: « In one manner Wisdom is sent, to be with man; in another He is sent, to be a man. *For into holy souls does He transfer Himself, and establishes them friends of God and Prophets*; just as He also fills the Holy Angels. But when the fullness of time came,

ut ipsum Verbum fieret caro, id est homo ».

He was sent, not to fill the Angels nor to be an Angel nor to be with men and/or in men,[12] as He was before in the Patriarch and in the Prophets, but so that the Word Himself might become flesh, that is a Man ».

Praeterea notandum est, quod cum his duobus modis mittatur Filius, secundum alterum dicitur missus in mundum, secundum alterum vero non. Eo enim modo missus in mundum dicitur, quo visibilis mundo apparuit. Unde Augustinus in eodem libro[13] ait: « Cum ex tempore cuiusquam mente percipitur, mitti quidem dicitur, sed non in hunc mundum. Non enim sensibiliter apparet, id est, corporeis sensibus praesto est. Nam et nos, secundum quod mente aliquid aeternum capimus, non in hoc mundo sumus, et omnium iustorum spiritus etiam in carne viventium, in quantum di- /-vina sapiunt, . . .

Besides it must be noted, that since the Son is sent in these two manners, according to one He is said (to have been) sent in to the world, according to the other (His is) not. For, He is said (to have been) sent into the world in that manner, whereby He appeared visible to the world. Whence (St.) Augustine in the same book[13] says: « When in time He is perceived by any mind, He is indeed said to be sent, but not into this world. For He does not appear sensibly, that is, is present [praesto] to the corporal senses. For we too, according to which we grasp anything eternal with our mind, are not in this world, and even the spirits of all of the just living in the flesh, inasmuch as they tasted divine (things), . . .

---

[1] Ioan. 7, 28. et 8, 12. — Paulo ante edd. 1, 2, 8 *Sed adhuc* pro *Sed ad hoc*.
[2] Cap. 5. n.9.
[3] Cod. D repetit *eius* post *missio*; in fine positionis ed. 3 omittit *est*.
[4] Cod. C *missus*.
[5] Alludit ad Sap. 7, 27, ubi Vulgata: *Et per nationes in animas sanctas se trasfert, amicos Dei et Prophetas constituit*.
[6] Cap. 20. n. 28. et aliqua verba n. 27. — In hoc loco August. et codd. A D legunt *eo ipso quo* loco *eo ipso quod*; deinde Vat. et ed. 4 omittunt *vel* post *sed*.
[7] Ioan. 16, 28.
[8] Sap. 9, 10. Vulgata: *Mitte illam* etc.
[9] Ed. 6 addit hic *Dei* et deinde omittit *Dei Filius*; post haec verba ultima edd. 2, 3, 5, 9 adiiciunt *et*.
[10] Cod. C addit *per gratiam*. Infra edd. 1, 8 omittunt *et* post *incarnationem*.
[11] Cap. 20. n. 27. — Rursus citatur Sap. 7, 27. In Vulgata deest *enim*, quod posuimus ex August., codd. omnibus et edd., exceptus Vat. et 3, 5.
[12] Edd. 1, 8 addunt *tantum*, et immediate ante ed. 1 legit *nec* pro *vel*.
[13] Cap. 20. n. 28. — In hoc textu codd. A C D addunt *etiam* post *Nam et nos*.

---

[1] John 7:28 and 8:12. — A little before this editions 1, 2 and 8, have *But still* [Sed adhuc] for *But to this* [Sed ad hoc].
[2] Chapter 5, n. 9.
[3] Codex D repeats *of Him* [eius] after *mission* [missio]; in this proposition edition 3 omits *is* [est].
[4] Codex C has *(to have been) sent* [missus].
[5] An allusion to Wis. 7:27, where the Vulgate reads: *And throughout the nations into holy souls does She transfer Herself, and establish them friends of God and Prophets* [Et per nationes in animas sanctas se trasfert, amicos Dei et Prophetas constituit: which text on account of the gender of Wisdom in Latin is usually rendered with the feminine pronoun; and on account of the gender of Him who is referred to as Wisdom, with the masculine pronoun, as is afterwards done].
[6] Chapter 20, n. 28 and the other words from n. 27. — In this passage, (St.) Augustine and codices A and D read *for the very reason by which* [eo ipso quo] in place of *for the very reason that* [eo ipso quod]; then the Vatican edition and edition 4 omit *either* [vel] after *but* [sed].
[7] John 16:28.
[8] Wis. 9:10. The Vulgate reads: *Send Her* [mitte illam].
[9] Edition 6 adds here *of God* [Dei] and then reads *He has been sent only once* [semel tantum missus est], omitting *the Son of God* [Dei Filius]; after these words editions 2, 3, 5 and 9 insert *and* [et].
[10] Codex C adds *through grace* [per gratiam]. Below this editions 1 and 8 omit *and* [et] after *Incarnation* [incarnationem].
[11] Chapter 20, n. 27. — Again Wis. 7:27 is cited. In the Vulgate *for* [enim] is lacking, which however we put on account of the text of (St.) Augustine, and all the codices and editions, except the Vatican and nn.

3 and 5.
[12] Editions 1 and 8 add *only* [tantum], and immediately before this edition 1 reads *nor* [nec] for *and/or* [vel].
[13] Chapter 20, n. 28. — In this text codices A C D add *even* [etiam] after *For we too* [Nam et nos].

di- / -vina sapiunt, non sunt in hoc mundo ». Ex praedictis liquet, quod praeter ineffabilem genituram duobus modis mittitur Filius, scilicet cum visibiliter apparuit, vel invisibiliter percipitur mente.

tasted divine (things), are not in this world ». From the aforesaid one may clarify [liquet], that besides the ineffable begetting the Son is sent in two manners, namely when He appeared visibly, and/or is perceived invisibly by the mind.

Cap. IX.

Quare Pater non dicitur missus.

Hic quaeritur, cur Pater non dicitur missus, cum ex tempore a quoquam cognoscitur, sicut Filius. Ad quod dicimus, quia in eo est principii auctoritas, qui[1] non habet, de quo sit, a quo Filius est et Spiritus sanctus. « Pater enim est, ut ait Augustinus in eodem libro,[2] principium totius divinitatis, vel si melius dicitur, deitatis », quia principium est Filiii et Spiritus sancti. Nam, ut ait Augustinus in eodem,[3] « si voluisset etiam Deus Pater per subiectam creaturam visibiliter apparare, absurdissime tamen aut a Filio, quem genuit, aut a Spiritu sancto, qui de illo procedit, missus diceretur ». Congruenter autem ille *missus* dicitur, qui in carne apparuit; *misisse* autem ille, qui in ea non apparuit.

Chapter IX

For what reason is the Father not said (to be) sent.

Here there is asked, why is the Father not said (to be) sent, when in time He is cognized by someone, just as the Son (is). To which we say, that in Him is the authority of a principle, who[1] does not have, from whom He is, by whom the Son is and the Holy Spirit (too). « For the Father is », as (St.) Augustine says in the same book,[2] « the Principle of the whole Divinity, and/or if it is better said, of the Deity », because He is the Principle of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. For, as (St.) Augustine says in the same (book),[3] « if God the Father had also wanted to appear visibly through a subjected creature, most absurdly would He be said (to have been) sent either by the Son, whom He begot, or by the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from Him ». Congruently on the one hand, is He said (to have been) *sent*, who appeared in the flesh; (and congruently) on the other, *to have sent* He, who did not appear in it.

Cap. X.

Quod Filius et Spiritus sanctus non sunt quasi minores Patre, quia missi.

Ideoque putaverunt quidam haeretici, cum Pater non sit missus, sed Filius et Spiritus sanctus, Patrem esse maiorem ac Filium minorem[4] et Spiritum sanctum; atque Patrem quasi maiorem misisse utrumque quasi minorm. Quod Augustinus improbat in quarto libro de Trinitate,[5] illis contradicens: « Non ideo, inquit, arbitrandum est, minorem esse Filium, quod

Chapter X

That the Son and the Holy Spirit are not as ones lesser than the Father, because (They have been) sent.

And for that reason certain heretics thought, since the Father has not been sent, but the Son and the Spirit (have), that the Father is greater or[4] the Son lesser and the Holy Spirit (likewise); and also that the Father as one greater has sent Each as lesser. Which (St.) Augustine disproves in the fourth book On the Trinity,[5] contradicting them: « Not for that reason », he says, « must it be

missus est a Patre, nec ideo minorem Spiritum sanctum, quia et Pater eum misit et Filius; sive enim propter visibilem creaturam, sive potius propter principii commendationem, non propter inaequalitatem vel imparillitatem vel disssimilitudinem substantiae in Scripturis haec posita intelliguntur ». Non ergo ideo dicitur Pater misisse Filium vel Spiritum sanctum, quod ille esset maior et illi minores, sed maxime propter auctoritatem principii commendandum, et quia in visibili creatura non, sicut illi,[6] apparuit. Ecce ostensum est, quae sit missio Filii, et quibus modis mittatur.

judged, that the Son is lesser, because He has been sent by the Father, nor for that reason the Holy Spirit lesser, because the Father sent Him and the Son (likewise); for either on account of the visible creature, or rather on account of the commendation of (Him as) Principle, not on account of inequality and/or imparity and/or dissimilitude of substance are these things posited in the Scriptures understood ». Therefore, the Father is not said to have sent the Son and/or the Holy Spirit for the reason, that He was greater and They lesser, but most of all for the sake of commending the authority of the Principle, and because in a visible creature He did not, like Them,[6] appear. Behold, it has been shown, what is the mission of the Son, and in what manners is He sent.

---

[1] Contra omnes codd. et ed. 6 perperam legit Vat. cum aliis edd. *quae*, cum relativum secundum contextum referendum sit ad *in eo*. Paulo ante codd. D E *quod* pro *quia*. Deinde post *Filius* Vat. sola omittit *est*.
[2] Libr. IV. c. 20. n. 29.
[3] Cap. 21. n. 32. — Vat. sola: *Quia etiam si voluisset* pro *Si voluisset etiam*. Deinde omnes edd., demptis Vat. et ed. 8, male legunt *appareret* pro *apparere*. Pro nostro lectione faciunt codd. et originale. Denique ante *procedit* codd. A C D bene legunt *ipso* for *illo*.
[4] Vat. et aliae edd., excepta 1, contra codd. excepto E, addunt *esse*.
[5] Cap. 21. n. 32. — In hoc loco auctoritate codd., edd. 1, 8 et originalis post *Spiritum sanctum* posuimus *quia* loco *quod*, et post *principii* expunximus *auctoritatem vel*.
[6] Vat. cum omnibus edd., excepta 1, mendose *ille*, contradicentibus omnibus codd.; *illi* refertur ad Filium et Spiritum sanctum.

[1] Contrary to nearly all the codices and edition 6, the Vatican with the other editions faultily reads *which* [quae], since the context of the relative must be referred to *in Him* [in eo]. A little before this codices C and E have *that* [quod] for *that* [quia]. Then after *the Son* [Filius] the Vatican alone omits *is* [est].
[2] Book IV, ch. 20, n. 29.
[3] Chapter 21, n. 32. — The Vatican edition alone reads: *Because even if God the Father had wanted* [Quia etiam si voluisset etc.]. Then all the editions, excepting the Vatican and n. 8, read badly *He would appear* [appareret] for *to appear* [apparere]. In favor of our reading are those of the codices and the original. And next at *who proceeds* [qui . . . procedit], codices A C D read well *Him* [ipso] for *Him* [illo].
[4] The Vatican and the other editions, except n. 1, contrary to the codices, except E, add *that . . . is* [esse].
[5] Chapter 21, n. 32. — In this passage on the authority of the codices, editions 1 and 8, and the original, after *the Holy Spirit is lesser* [minorem Spiritum sanctum], we have put *because* [quia] in place of *because* [quod], and before *commendation* [commendationem] we have expunged *authority and/or* [auctoritatem vel].
[6] The Vatican edition together with all the editions, except n. 1, faultily reads *like the Former (i.e. the Father)* [sicut ille], contradicting all the codices; *They* [illi] refers to the Son and the Holy Spirit.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

De missione quantum ad principium et modum.

PARS I.
De missione sive temporali processione quantum ad principium.
ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 258-261.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Hic considerandum est, cum ipse Spiritus sanctus detur hominibus a Patre et Filio.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Supra egit Magister de processione temporali ipsius Spiritus sancti, secundum quod est a Patre et Filio; hic *secundo* ostendit, quod temporaliter procedit a se ipso; et hoc intendit in tota ista parte usque ibi: *Hic quaeritur, utrum semel tantum sit missus Filius*, ubi incipit agere quantum ad *modum* processionis.[1]

Habet autem haec pars quatuor partes. In *prima* ostendit, quod Spiritus sanctus temporaliter a se mittitur, datur et procedit, et hoc *deducendo ad impossibile*, quia aliter non essent indivisa opera Trinitatis. In *secunda* ostendit *a minori* per auctoritatem, quod Pater misit Filium una cum Spiritu

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

On mission as much as regards its principle and manner.

PART I
On mission or temporal procession as much as regards its principle.
ARTICLE SOLE

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 258-261.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Here there must be considered, since the Holy Spirit is given to men by the Father and the Son etc..

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

Above Master (Peter) deals with the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit Himself, according to which it is from the Father and the Son; here he shows *second*, that He proceeds temporally from Himself; and he tries to prove [intendit] this in that entire part up to there (where he says): *Here there is asked, whether the Son has been sent only once*, where he begins to deal (with it) as much as regards *the manner* of the procession.[1]

Moreover this part has four parts. In *the first* he shows, that the Holy Spirit is sent by, given by, and proceeds from the Holy Spirit temporally, that this *by a deduction to the impossible* [deducendo ad impossibile], that otherwise the works of the Trinity would not be undivided. In *the second* he

sancto, ita quod Spiritus sanctus missit Filium, in . . .

shows a minori through authorship, that the Father sent the Son one with the Holy Spirit, such that the Holy Spirit sent the Son, in . . .

[1] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 *de modo* loco *quantum ad modum*, deinde post *processionis* addit *seu missionis Filii, qui est visibilis et invisibilis. Et hoc quodam modo accidentaliter, cum ista missio et Filio conveniat et Spiritui sancto*.

[1] The Vatican edit ion, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, has *with the manner* [de modo] in place of *(with it) as much as regards the manner* [quantum ad modum], then after *procession* [processionis] it adds *or of the mission of the Son, who is visible and invisible. And this in a certain manner accidentally, since that mission of His befits the Son and the Holy Spirit* [seu missionis Filii, qui est visibilis et invisibilis. Et hoc quodam modo accidentaliter, cum ista missio et Filio conveniat et Spiritui sancto.].

quem nullo modo[1] habet auctoritatem, ergo multo fortius mittit se; et hoc facit ibi: *Ne autem mireris, quod Spiritus sanctus dicitur mitti vel procedere a se*. In *teria* vero parte ostendit hoc *a simili*: si enim Filius misit se, pari ratione et Spiritus sanctus se; et hoc facit ibi: *Deinde ostendit datum esse etiam a se ipso*. In *quarta* vero et ultima opponit contra praedicta, et hoc ibi: *Sed ad hoc opponitur: Si Filius a se ipso* etc., ubi etiam solvit et breviter epilogat praedeterminata.

whom he has in no manner[1] an authorship, therefore much more strongly does He send Himself; and this he does there (where he says): *But do not wonder, that the Holy Spirit is said to be sent and/or to proceed from Himself*. In *the third* part, on the other hand, he shows this a simili: for if the Son sent Himself, for an equal reason the Holy Spirit (sent) Himself; and this he does there (where he says): *Then he shows that He has also been sent from Himself*. However, in *the fourth* and last he opposes (arguments) against the aforesaid, and this there (where he says): *But to this is opposed: 'If the Son by Himself'* etc., where he also solves and briefly concludes the predetermined (arguments).

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad intelligentiam huius partis quatuor quaeruntur:

Primo quaeritur, utrum missio sit in divinis.

Secundo, dato quod sic,[2] utrum missio sit ex tempore vel aeterna.

Tertio quaeritur, cuius sit missio ut missi.

Quarto, cuius sit missio ut mittentis.

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For an understanding of this part four (things) are asked:

First there is asked, whether there is mission is among the divine.

Second, granted that there is,[2] whether the mission is on account of time and/or eternal.

Third there is asked, to whom does the mission belong as to one sent.

Fourth, to whom does the mission belong as to the one sending.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

De missione in divinis.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum in divinis sit missio.

CIRCA PRIMUM, quod mission sit in divinis, ostenditur:

ARTICLE SOLE

On mission among the divine.

QUESTION I

Whether there is mission among the divine.

ABOUT THE FIRST, that there is mission among the divine, is shown:

1. Primo per scripturam veteris Testamenti, Sapientiae nono:[3] *Mitte illam de caelis*, et loquitur de Sapientiae, quae est Dei Filius.

1. First through the writing of the Old Testament, in the ninth (chapter) of Wisdom:[3] *Send Her from Thy holy heavens*, and (that) Wisdom is spoken of, which is the Son of God.

2. Item, per scripturam novi Testamenti, ad Galatas quarto:[4] *At ubi venit plenitudo temporis, missit Deus Filium suum*. Et post:[5] *Quoniam estis filii Dei, misit Deus Spiritum Filii sui in corda vestra*.

2. Likewise, through the writing of the New Testament, in the fourth (chapter) of (the Letter) to the Galatians:[4] *But when the fullness of time came, God sent His own Son*. And afterwards:[5] *Since you are the sons of God, God sent the Spirit of His Son into your hearts*.

3. Item, hoc ostenditur per testimonium Veritatis, Ioannis decimo sexto:[6] *cum autem abiero, mittam vobis Spiritum veritatis*.

3. Likewise, this is shown through the testimony of the Truth, in the sixteenth (chapter of the Gospel) of (St.) John:[6] *but when I go away, I shall sent you the Spirit of Truth*.

4. Item, *ratione* videtur[7] istud idem: quia mittere non est aliud quam ex se aliquem producere in alium, sicut sol radium mittit in aëra; sed Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio procedit in creaturam: ergo ab eis mittitur.

4. Likewise, that same is seen[7] *by reason*: because "to send" is nothing other than to lead something forth [producere] into another, just as the Sun sends a ray into the lower heavens [in aëra]; but the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son into the creature: therefore He is sent by Them.

5. Item, quandocumque datur aliquid alicui ut absenti, convenienter dicitur mitti; sed tota Trinitas est absens peccatoribus quantum ad gratiam inhabitantem: ergo quandocumque datur Spiritus sanctus quantum ad gratiam inhabitantem, non incongrue dicitur mitti; si ergo *dari* est in divinis hoc modo, ut dictum est,[8] ergo et *missio*.

5. Likewise, whensoever anything is given to anyone as to one absent, it is fittingly said that (it) is sent; but the whole Trinity is absent to sinners as much as regards indwelling grace: therefore whensoever the Holy Spirit is given as much as regards indwelling grace, He is not incongruously said to be sent; if, therefore, *to be given* is among the divine in this manner, as was said,[8] therefore also *mission*.

Contra: 1. Ubicumque est missio, ibi est *separatio*; unde Hieronymus super Ezechielem:[9] « Quod coniunctum est et in uno corpore copulatum mitti non potest, sed quod extra est »; unde non mittitur manus, sed iaculum. Sed in divinis est omnimoda indivisio et nulla separatio: ergo etc.

On the contrary: 1. Wheresoever there is mission, there is *separation*; wherefore (St.) Jerome (says) on Ezechiel:[9] « What has been conjoined and united [copulatum] in one body cannot be sent, but what is outside (can be) »; whence a hand is not sent, but a dart (can). But among the divine there is an omnimodal indivision and no separation: ergo etc..

2. Item, ubicumque est missio, ibi[10] est missi ad mittentem *subiectio*; quod patet: dominus enim mittit servum, et non servus dominum. Sed in divinis est omnimoda aequalitas et nulla subiectio: ergo ibi non est missio.

2. Likewise, wheresoever mission is, there[10] is a *subjection* of the one sent to the one sending; which is clear: for a lord sends the servant, and not the servant the lord. But among the divine there is an omnimodal equality and no subjection: therefore there is not mission There.

3. Item, ubicumque est missio, ibi est *mutatio*, quia non dicitur aliquid mitti, ubi est; sed in divinis nulla omnino cadit

3. Likewise, wheresoever mission is, there is *change* [mutatio], because something is not said to be sent, where it is; but among the

mutatio: ergo etc.

4. Item, missio, passive dicta, in quantum talis est opus ministerii, sed in nobilissima natura in quantum talis non cadit ministerium: ergo etc.

CONCLUSIO.

Missio est in divinis; tamen a triplici respectu missionis ad principium, ad terminum, ad missum removenda est omnis imperfectio, qualis inest missioni in creaturis.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod missio est in divinis, sicut ostendunt praedictae auctoritates et rationes; et transfertur a creaturis ad Deum.

divine entirely no change occurs: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, mission, passively said, inasmuch as (iit is) such, is a work of ministry, but in the Most Noble Nature, inasmuch as (it is) such, ministry does not occur: ergo etc..

CONCLUSION

There is a mission among the divine; yet from the threefold looking-back of mission to its principle, to its terminus, to the one sent, every imperfection is to be removed, such as is in a mission among creatures.

I respond: It must be said, that there is mission among the divine, just as the aforesaid authorities and reasons show: and it is transferred from creatures to God.

[1] Ed. 1 *nullam* pro *nullo modo*. Mox cod. V *misit* pro *mittit*.
[2] Cod. T repetit hic *quaeritur*, ed. 1 vero omittit *dato quod sic*.
[3] Vers. 10.
[4] Vers. 4, in quo textu fide mss. et Vulgatae substituimus *At ubi* loco *Cum*.
[5] Ibid. vers. 6.
[6] Vers. 7, ubi Vulgata: Si autem abiero, mittam eum (Paraclitum) ad vos, c. 15, 26: Quem ego mittam vobis a Patre, spiritum veritatis. — Paulo ante unus alterve codex ut S. post *hoc* addit *ipsum*.
[7] Cod. S *ostenditur*. Dein ed. 1 *illud* pro *istud*. Paulo infra codices et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 secuti posuimus *aëra* pro *aërem*.
[8] Dist. 14. a. 1. q. 1, et a. 2. q. 1.
[9] Cap. 16. vers. 54, in quibus verbis originalis post *extra* exhibent *corpus*.
[10] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *ibi*.

[1] Edition 1 has *no* [nullam] for *in no manner an* [nullo modo]. Then codex V reads *did He send* [misit] for *does He send* [mittit].
[2] Codex T repeats here *there is asked* [quaeritur], but edition 1 omits *granted that it is* [dato quod sic].
[3] Verse 10.
[4] Verse 4, in which text, trusting in the manuscripts and the Vulgate, we have substituted *But when* [At ubi] for *When* [Cum].
[5] Ibid., verse 6.
[6] Verse 7, where the Vulgate reads. But if I shall go away, I shall send Him (the Paraclete) to you, John 15:26: Whom I shall send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth. — A little before this one or the other codex, such as S, after *this* [hoc] adds *very same (thing)* [ipsum].
[7] Codex S has *is shown* [ostenditur]. Then edition 1 has *that* [illud] for that [istud]. A little below this, having followed codices and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6, we have put *the lower heavens* [aëra] for *air* [*aërem*].
[8] Distinction 14, a. 1, q. 1, and a. 2, q. 1.
[9] Ezech. 15:54, among which words in the original there is exhibited *the body* [corpus] after *outside* [extra].
[10] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *there* [ibi].

p. 260

Secundum autem quod missio in his inferioribus consideratur, habet respectum ad tria, scilicet ad *principium* et ad *terminum* et ad *missum*.

Ad *principium* sive ad mittentem sub triplici habitudine comparari contingit: ut ad dantem *esse*, et sic mittitur radius a sole; ut ad dantem *virtutem*, et sic mittitur iaculum a proiectore; ut ad dantem *iurisdictionem*

Moreover, according to which mission is considered among these inferiors, it has a regard for three (things), namely to (its) *principle*, and to (its) *terminus* and to *the one sent*.

It happens that it is compared to *the principle* or to the one sending under a threefold habitude: as to one giving '*being*' and in this manner a ray is sent from the Son; as to the one giving *virtue*, and in this

sive auctoritatem, et sic mittitur nuntius a praetore.[1] Secundum omnem hanc comparationem est in divinis missio; quia Spiritus sanctus mittitur a Patre et Filio tanquam habens *esse* et *virtutem* et *auctoritatem* in operando ab eis; et ideo missio secundum hunc respectum st completissime[2] in divinis. Non enim est ponere, quod una persona recipiat auctoritatem, nisi a quo recipit virtutem, nec virtutem, nisi a quo recipit esse.

manner a dart is sent by the thrower [proiectore]; as to one giving *jurisdiction* or authority, and in this manner a messenger is sent by an officer [praetore].[1] According to all these comparisons [omnem hanc comparationem] there is mission among the divine; because the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son as One having '*being*' and *virtue* and *authority* in operating by Them; and for that reason mission according to this respect is most completely[2] among the divine. For it is not that one posits, that one person receives authority (from anyone), except (from the one) from whom he receives virtue, nor virtue, except (from the one) from whom he receives 'being'.

Similiter ad *terminum* sub triplici habitudine comparatur. Mittitur enim aliquid alicubi,[3] ubi videlicet *quietatur*, ut lapis mittitur deorsum; mittitur etiam alicui, ut a quo *habeatur*, sicut aliquis mittit alicui donum; mittitur etiam ut *ad aliquid*, quod scilicet operetur. Secundum hanc triplicem comparationem est missio in divinis. Mittitur enim Filius vel Spiritus sanctus ut alicubi ad *inhabitandum*, ut alicui ad *possidendum* ut donum, ut ad *aliquid*, scilicet ad effectum conferendum.[4] Et ideo missio per comparationem ad terminum reperitur completissime in divinis, multo magis quam in creaturis.

Similarly, it is compared to *the terminus* under a threefold habitude. For something is sent somewhere,[3] where, namely, *it rests*, as a stone is sent downward; is also sent to someone, as by whom *it is had*, just as someone sends someone a gift; is sent also as *for something*, which, that is, it works. According to this threefold comparison there is mission among the divine. For the Son and/or the Holy Spirit is sent so as to *indwell* somewhere, so as to someone *to be possessed* as a gift, so as for *something*, that is, to confer[4] an effect. And for that reason mission through a comparison to (its) terminus is found most completely among the divine, much more than among creatures.

Si autem loquimur de missione in comparatione ad *missum*, sic in his inferioribus ponit triplicem conditionem *imperfectionis*, scilicet *separationem*, *subiectionem* et *mutationem*; quae quidem non sunt in divinis. Est tamen aliquid perfectionis ibi istis correspondens; et ratio huius patet sic.

Moreover, if we speak of mission in comparison to *the one sent*, in this manner it posits among these inferiors a threefold condition *of imperfection*, that is, *separation*, *subjection*, and *change* [mutationem]; which indeed are not among the divine. However, there is something of perfection corresponding to these There; and the reason for this is clear in this manner:

In istis inferioribus separatur missus a mittente propter distantiam termini a mittente;[5] ut patet, cum mitto aliquem Romam; quia Roma distat a me, si ille debet esse Romae, oportet quod separetur a me. In divinis vero, quia Deus mittens est ubique, nulla est distantia, et ideo nulla est separatio; loco tamen huius est missi a mittente egressio,[6] sive emanatio.

Among these inferiors the one sent is separated from the one sending on account of the distance of the terminus from the one sending;[5] as is clear, when I send someone to Rome; because Rome is distant from me, if (the one sent) ought to be at Rome, it is necessary [oportet] that he be separated from me. On the other hand, among the divine, because the God sending is everywhere, there is no distance, and for

that reason there is no separation; yet in place of this there is the egress, or emanation, of the one sent from the one sending.[6]

1. Et sic patet responsio ad illud quod obiicitur de conditione *separationis*.

1. And thus is clear the response to that which is objected concerning the condition of *separation*.

Similiter in his inferioribus est in misso *subiectio* propter differrentiam mittentis ad missum. Quia enim missus recipit a mittente vel esse, vel virtutem, vel operationem, et est separatus ab eo in substantia — quia substantia omnino eadem non participatur a pluribus — necesse est, quod aliam virtutem recipiat ab eo et aliam iurisdictionem illa inferiorem. Sed in divinis non est substantialis differentia, et ideo omnia sunt aequalis nobilitatis in mittente et misso. Sed tamen loco huius est *subauctoritatis* emanatio.[7]

Similarly among these inferiors there is in the one sent a *subjection* on account of the difference of the one sending to the one sent. For because the one sent receives from the one sending either "being", and/or virtue, and/or operation, it is also separated from it in substance — because a substance entirely the same is not shared by many — it is necessary, that it receive some virtue from it and some jurisdiction inferior to it. But among the divine there is not a substantial difference, and for that reason all (these) are of equal nobility in the One sending and the One sent. But yet in place of this there is an emanation[7] of *subauthorship*.

2. Et sic patet secunda obiectio.

2. And thus is clear the second objection.

Similiter in his inferioribus est in misso *mutatio* propter distantiam missi a termino. Quia[8] enim non est in termino, ad quem mittitur, ideo oportet quod mutet locum, et ita quod sit in eo mutatio. Quia vero in divinis missus nulli loco abest, non oportet, quod personaliter accedat; et ideo *non* est ibi *mutatio*. Sed tamen loco eius est alicuius effectus de novo productio.

Similarly among these inferiors there is in the one sent a *change* on account of the distance of the one sent from the terminus. For because[8] it is not at the terminus [in termino], to which it is sent, for that reason it is necessary [oportet] that it change place, and thus that there be in it a change. On the other hand, because among the divine the One sent is absent to no place, it is not required [non oportet], that He approach personally; and for that reason there is *not a change* There. But yet in place of this there is the production of some effect anew.

3. Et sic patet tertia obiectio. Quamvis enim in divinis non sit separatio, subiectio et mutatio, tamen loco horum est emanatio,[9] subauctoritatis origo et novi effectus productio.

3. And thus is clear the third objection. For although among the divine there is not separation, subjection and change, yet in place of these there is emanation, origin of sub-authorship and the production of a new effect.

4. Ad illud quod ultimo obiicitur, quod pertinet ad ministerium; dicendum, quod hoc verum est, ubi missio dicit subiectionem; sed hoc non est in divina natura, sed in creaturis.

4. To that which is objected last, that it pertains to ministry; it must be said, that this is true, where "being sent" [missio] means "being subjected" [subiectio]; but this is not in the Divine Nature, but (rather) in creatures.

SCHOLION.

I. Quomodo differant *temporalis processio*, *missio*, *datio* Spiritus sancti non eodem modo ab antiquis Scholasticis

SCHOLIUM

I. In what manner the *temporal procession*, *mission*, (and) *giving* of the Holy Spirit differ is not determined in the same manner by

determinatur. Audiamus Richard. a Med. (I. Sent. d. 14. a. 1. q. 3): « Quidam volunt, quod non differunt realiter, sed secundum rationem tantum. Nam processio temporalis principalius importat respectum ad *terminum ad quem*, missio ad *principium a quo*, donatio vero *ad effectum*. Alii autem maiorem differentiam conantur assignare inter haec tria. Dicunt enim, quod *processio temporalis* de principali significato non significat nisi processionem aeternam cum quodam respectu secundum rationem vel secundum dici ad creaturam, et actu connotat novum effectum in creatura et novam realem relationem in creatura ad Spiritum sanctum. *Donatio* vero de suo principali significato non dicit aliquam emanationem, quia tota Trinitas dat se ipsam, loquendo de emanatione secundum rem, qua emanat ipsamet persona, sed dicit emanationem doni ap- /-propriati . . .

the ancient Scholastics. Let us hear Richard of Middleton (Sent., Bk. I, d. 14, a. 1, q. 3): « Certain ones want, that they do not really differ, but only according to a reckoning. For the temporal procession principally conveys a looking-back to the *terminus to which*, the mission to the *principle from which*, but the donation *to the effect*. Moreover, some strive to assign a greater difference among these three. For they say, that the *temporal procession* in its principal signifiied [de principali significato] does not signify except the eternal procession with a certain looking-back according to a reckoning and/or according to a being-said regarding the creature, and in act connotes a new effect in the creature and a new, real relation in the creature to the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, *donation* in its principal signified does not mean some emanation, because the whole Trinity gives Itself — speaking of emanation according to the thing, by which the very Person Himself emanates — but (rather) means the emanation of the gift appropriated . . .

[1] Multi codd. cum edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 perperam *praeceptore*.
[2] Cod. M addit *etiam*.
[3] Vat. in huius et sequentis propositionis membris semper exhibet *alicui*; codd. inter se sunt divisi, alii enim ter *alicubi* ponunt, alii ut F H T etc. cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem nostram, quae et contextui magis correspondet.
[4] Consentientibus antiquis mss. cum ed. 1, substituimus *conferendum* pro *operandum*. Mox aliqui codd. ut A N *secundum* loco *per*.
[5] Vat. cum cod. cc *ad mittentem*, sed minus bene et contra alios codd. cum ed. 1. — Paulo infra post *quod* cod. I addit *distet et*.
[6] Cod. K, interpunctione mutata, *separatio loci; tamen huiusmodi missio est a mittente* etc.
[7] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 *origo*. De subauctoritate vide infra q. 4. in corp., et supra d. 12. q. 2, dein d. 20. a. 1. q. 2. ad 4. — Paulo ante cod. W pro *omnia* ponit *omnino*, quod refertur ad *virtutem* et *iurisdictionem*.
[8] Ex mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 substituimus *quia* loco *cum*, et paulo infra ex antiquioribus codd. cum ed. 1 supplevimus perperam omissum *ita*.
[9] Cod. I *tamen loco harum est personae emanatio*.

[1] Many codices together with edition 1, 2 and 3, faultily read *instructor* [praeceptore].
[2] Codex M adds *also* [etiam].
[3] The Vatican edition among the members of this and the following proposition always exhibits *to someone* [alicui]; the codices are divived among themselves, for some put three times *somewhere* [alicubi], others, such as F H T etc. together with edition 1, exhibit our reading, which also corresponds more with the context.
[4] With the consent of the ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *confer* [conferendum] for *work* [operandum]. Then some codices, such as A and N, have *according to* [secundum] for *through* [per].
[5] The Vatican edition together with codex cc has *to the one sending* [ad mittentem], but less well and contrary to the other codices together with edition 1. — A little below this after *that* [quod] codex I adds *he be distant and* [distet et].
[6] Codex K, with changed punctuation, has *there is no separation of place; yet mission of this king is from one sending* etc. [nulla est separatio loci; tamen huiusmodi missio est a mittente].
[7] The Vatican edition without the authority of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 or 3, has *origin* [origo]. On subauthorship see below q. 4 in the body of the response, and above d. 12, q. 2, then d. 20, a. 1, q. 2 in reply to n. 4. — A little before this codex W puts *entirely* [omnino] in place of *all (these)* [omnia], which refers to *virtue* and *jurisdiction*.
[8] From the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, we have substituted *because* [quia] for *when* [cum], and

a little below this from the more ancient codices together with edition 1, we have supplied the faultily omitted *thus* [ita].

[9] Codex I reads *yet in place of these there is emanation of a Person* [tamen loco harum est personae emanatio].

---

p. 261

ap- / -priopriati personae, in quo dono etiam ipsamet persona vera datur recipienti illud donum. *Missio* vero dicit respectum personae emanantis per emanationem alicuius rei visibilis vel invisibilis appropriatae illi personae. Et ita de principali significato missionis non est emanatio personae, sed est de cointellectu significati missionis, sicut nasus non est de principali significato simitatis, quamvis simitas nasi nasum includat de cointellectu ». Ipse Richard. a Med. praefert secundam opinionem, infra d. 15. p. I. a. 3. q. 1.

appropriated to the Person, in which gift the true (and) very Person Himself is also given to the one receiving that gift. On the other hand, *mission* means a looking-back to the Person emanating through the emanation of some thing visible and/or invisible appropriated to that Person. And thus concerning mission's principal signification there is not an emanation of Person, but there is concerning missions co-intellected signification, just as a nose does not concern the principal signification of simity, although the simity of the nose includes the nose from its co-intellection ». Richard of Middleton himself prefers the second opinion, below in d. 15, p. I, a. 3, q. 1.

His verbis iam manifestatur, aliquos putasse, missionem *principaliter* significare processionem unius personae ab alia, sed *connotare* maifestationem eiusdem. Ita Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 71. m. 2. et 4, et nonnulli moderni, ut Suarez. Sed S. Bonav. infra (q. 4. in corp. et clarius ibi ad 3.) dicit: « Missio de se duo importat, scil. emanationem et manifestationem, et *principaliter* de ratione suae significationis *importat manifestationem* ». Eandem sententiam profitentur. S. Thom. (hic q. 1. a. 2; d. 16. q. 1. a. 1; S. I. q. 43. a. 2. praesertim ad 3.), Scot. (I. Sent. d. 16. q. unic.), B. Albert. Petr. a Tar., Richard. a Med., locis infra citatis.

With these words there is already manifest, that some thought, that mission *principally* signified the procession of one Person from another (Person), but *connoted* the manifestation of the Same. Thus Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 71, m. 2 and 4, and not a few moderns, such as Suarez. But St. Bonaventure below (q. 4 in the body of the response and more clearly in reply to n. 3) says: « Mission of itself conveys two (significations), that is emanation and manifestation, and *principally* from the reckoning of its own signification *it conveys manifestation* ». The same sentence is proffered by St. Thomas (here in q. 1, a. 2; d. 16, q. 1, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 43, a. 2 especially in reply to n. 3), Bl John Duns Scotus (Sent, Bk. I, d. 16, q. sole), St. Albertus Magnus, Bl. Peter of Tarentaise, and Richard of Middleton, in the passages cited below.

II. In responsione S. Bonav. docet, triplicem in missione includi respectum, et haec tria membra iterum triplicter comparat. Secundum hos multiplices respetus resolvit, quae sint a divinis missionibus removenda, quaeve in iis ponenda.

II. In the response St. Bonaventure teaches, that there is a threefold looking-back included in mission, and he compares these three members again in a threefold manner. According to these multiple looking-backs he resolves, that there are to be removed from the divine missions, all (the imperfections) to be posited in these.

III. Alex. Hal. S. p. I. q. 71. m.1. — Scot., de

III. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 71,

hac et seqq. hic et in Report. q. unic. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1: S. I. q. 43. a. 1. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 14. a. 3. 4. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 1. 2. 3. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1. — Durand., de hac et seq. hic. q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1. — Biel, de hac et seqq. hic q. unic.

m. 1. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, on this and the following questions here and in the Reportatio, q. sole. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 43, a. 1. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), Sent., Bk. I, d. 14, aa. 3 and 4. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, aa. 1, 2 and 3. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1 q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st princ., q. 1. — Durandus, on this and the following question, here in q. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1. — (Gabriel) Biel, on this and the following question, here in the q. sole.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

PARS I.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 261-262.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

PART I

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 261-262.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum missio in divinis sit tantum ex tempore, an etiam ab aeterno.

QUESTION 2

Whether mission among the divine is only on account of time, or also from eternity.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum missio in divinis sit ex tempore tantum, an etiam ab aeterno. Et quod ab aeterno, ostenditur *auctoritate* et *ratione*.

Second thre is asked, whether mission among the divine is only on account of time [ex tempore],* or also from eternity. And that (it is) from eternity, is shown *by authority* and *by reason*.

1. *Auctoriate* sic: Gregorius:[1] « Eo ipso mittitur Filius, quo generatur »; sed generatur ab aeterno: ergo mittitur ab aeterno: ergo missio in divinis est ab aeterno.

1. *By authority* in this manner: (Pope St.) Gregory (the Great):[1] « The Son is sent according to that very manner, whereby He is generated »; but He is generated from eternity: therefore He is sent from eternity: therefore mission among the divine is from eternity.

2. Item, Beda in homilia:[2] « Spiritus sancti missio est eius processio »; sed procedit ab aeterno: ergo mittitur ab aeterno.

2. Likewise, (St.) Bede (the Venerable) in the homily:[2] « The Holy Spirit's being-sent is His procession »; but He proceeds from eternity: therefore He is sent from eternity.

3. Item, *ratione* sic: missio, sive active sive passive dicta, est Deus; sed omnis actio, quae active et passive est Deus, est ab aeterno: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, *by reason* in this manner: "mission" (in God), either actively or passively said, is God; but every action, which is actively and passively is God, is from eternity: ergo etc..

4. Item, omnis actio, quae habet Deum ut terminum et ut principium, est ab aeterno, ut patet, cum dicitur: Deus intelligit Deum,[3] Deus generat Deum; sed missio est huiusmodi, quia Deus mittit Deum: ergo missio est aeterna. *Si dicas*, quod missio requirit duplicem terminum, scilicet eum qui mittitur, et eum ad quem mittitur, et ille ad quem fit missio, est temporalis; *contra*: Deus potest esse qui mittit, Deus, qui mittitur: ergo pari ratione Deus, ad quem mittitur; et videtur, quod istae comparationes principii et termini maxime Deo conveniant. Deus enim est *alpha et omega, principium et finis*:[4] ergo magis proprie dicitur Deus, ad quem mittitur, quam Deus, qui mittitur.

4. Likewise, every action, which has God as (its) terminus and as (its) principle, is from eternity, as is clear, when there is said: "God understands God",[3] "God generates God"; but mission is of this kind, because God sends God: therefore the mission is eternal. *If you say*, that mission requires a twofold terminus, that is 'him who is sent', and 'him to whom he is sent', and the one to whom the mission comes to be, is temporal: *on the contrary*: God can be the One who sends, God, the one who is sent: therefore for an equal reason God, to whom He is sent; and it seems, that those comparisons of principle and terminus befit God most of all. For God is *the Alpha an the Omega, the Principle and the End*:[4] therefore more properly is God said (to be the One), to whom it is sent, than God, who is sent.

5. Item, quidquid est Deus, est aeternum; missio est Deus: ergo est aeterna; sed praemissae sunt verae: ergo et conclusio.

5. Likewise, whatever is God, is eternal; mission (in God) is God: therefore it is eternal; but the premises are true: therefore also the conclusion.

Contra: 1. Ioannis decimo sexto:[5] *Si non abiero Paraclitus non veniet ad vos; cum autem abiero, mittam vobis eum*. Ergo Spiritus sanctus potest mitti et promitti; sed quod est aeternum non potest promitti: ergo etc.

On the contrary: 1. In the sixteenth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John[5] (there is written): *If I will not go away the Paraclete will not come to you; but when I shall go away, I shall send Him to you*. Therefore the Holy Spirit can be sent and promised; what is eternal cannot be promised: ergo etc..

2. Item, Augustinus quarto de Trinitate:[6] « Mittitur Filius vel Spiritus sanctus, cum ex tempore cuiusquam mente percipitur ».

3. Item, omnis missio est ad[7] aliquid posterius mittente; sed ubi cadit posterius necessario intervenit ratio principii et temporis: ergo etc. Prima propositio per se est vera, quia mittens per prius habet ipsum quod[8] mittit, quam habet ille, ad quem mittit.

4. Item omnis missio vel est ratione mutationis, vel ratione operationis; sed in divinis non est mutatio: ergo ad hoc, quod missio sit, necese est quod interveniat operatio; et si operatio, et effectus; et si effectus, et[9] tempus: ergo omnis missio est ex tempore.

CONCLUSIO.

Missio propter comparationem ad terminum creatum dicenda est temporalis.

Respondeo: Dicendum ad praedicta, quod missio in divinis nullo modo dicitur nisi ex tempore. Et ratio huius est, quia dicit comparationem non tantum ad principium nec tantum ad misusm, sed . . .

2. Likewise, (St.) Augustine in the fourth (book) On the Trinity[6] (says): « The Son and/or the Holy Spirit is sent, when in time He is perceived by the mind of anyone ».

3. Likewise, every mission is to[7] something posterior to the one sending; but where there occurs a posterior there necessarily intervenes the reckoning of a principle and of time: ergo etc.. The first proposition is true per se, because the one sending, through (a consideration of what is) prior, has that which[8] he sends, rather than the one, to whom he sends (it), has (it).

4. Likewise every mission either is by reason of a change, and/or by reason of an operation; but among the divine there is not change: therefore for this, that there be a mission, it is necessary that an operation intervene; and if an operation, also an effect; and if an effect, also[9] a time: therefore every mission is on account of time.

CONCLUSION

Mission on account of its comparison to the created terminus must be said to be temporal.

I respond: It must be said, regarding the aforesaid, that mission among the divine is in no manner to be said except on account of time. And the reason for this is, because it means a comparison not only to the principle nor only to the one sent, but . . .

---

[1] Homil. 26. n. 2. in Evang.: Eo enim ipso a Patre Filius mitti dicitur, quo a Patre generatur. In quo textu plurimi codd. et ed. 1 omittunt *ipso*.
[2] Vide d. XIV. lit Magistri, c. 1.
[3] Reliquimus *Deum*, quod in fere omnibus codd. et sex primis edd. non bene decidit (forte propter immediate sequentem repeitionem nominis *Deus*); idem recurrit mox post *generat*.
[4] Apoc. 1, 8.
[5] Vers. 7; ultimam huius textus partem Vulgata ita exhibet: *Si autem abiero, mittam eum ad vos*. — Mox post *eum* fide plurium mss. ut F H I T X aa bb ff et ed. 1 expunximus *Cum*, quod propter formam argumenti melius deest.
[6] Cap. 20. n. 28. Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 7. et 8. — In principio verborum Augustini nonnulli codd. ut I bb ff cum ed. 1 ponunt *Tunc mittitur* etc.
[7] Ex mss. ed ed. 1 supplevimus *ad*, quod Vat., ut ex subnexis patet, male omittit. Cod. Z particulae *ad* praemittit *ab aliquo*, loco cuius cod. O habet *aliquo modo*.
[8] Unus alterque codex u T cc *quem*.
[9] Plures codd. ut F G I K T V Y aa bb ee ff cum ed. 1

[1] Homilies on the Gospel, 26, n. 2: For the Son is said to be sent by the Father for the very reason, that He is generated by the Father. In which text very many codices and edition 1 omit *very* [ipso]. [Trans. Note: in this ambiguous phrase of St. Gregory the Latin construction *eo . . .quo* has both this sense and that understood in n. 1].
[2] See the text of Master (Peter), Distinction XIV, ch. 1.
[3] We leave the second *God* [Deum] in place, though nearly all the codices and six first editions have let it fall, perhaps on account of the immediately following repetition of the noun *God* [God]; likewise it recurs just after *generates* [generat].
[4] Apoc. 1:8.
[5] Verse 7; the last part of this text is exhibited thus in the Vulgate: *But if I will go away, I shall send Him to you* [Si autem abiero, mittam eum ad vos]. — Then at the beginning of the next sentence, trusting in very many manuscripts, such as F H I T X aa bb ff and edition 1, we have expunged *When* [Cum], which on account of the form of the argument is better omitted.

omittunt *et*.

[6] Chapter 20, n. 28. See here the text of Master (Peter), chs. 7 and 8. — At the beginning of the words of (St.) Augustine not a few codices, such as I bb and ff together with edition 1, add *Then* [Tunc].
[7] From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *to* [ad], which the Vatican edition, as is clear from what follows, badly omits. Codex Z prefixes to this *to* [ad] *from someone* [ab aliquo], in place of which codex O has *in some manner* [aliquot modo].
[8] One or the other codex, such as T and cc, read *the one whom* [ipsum quem].
[9] Very many codices, such as F G I K T V Y aa bb ee and ff, together with edition 1, omit *also* [et].
* [Trans. note: See ex tempore in the Rationale for the Translation of Peculiar Latin Terms in the Introduction to this English Translation.]

---

etiam ad terminum. Terminus[1] ille de necessitate creatus est, quia missio in Deo, cum non dicat mutationem, dicit aliquam circa terminum operationem, et ita aliquem effectum, et quia omne quod recipit effectum, est creatum et temporale: ideo missio de necessitate est temporalis.

also to the terminus. That terminus[1] of necessity is created, because mission in God, since it does not mean a change, means some operation about the terminus, and thus some effect, and because everything which receives an effect, is created and temporal: for that reason mission of necessity is temporal.

1. Ad illud ergo quod dicit Gregorius: « Eo mittitur Filius, quo generatur »; dicendum, quod ipse loquitur, praesupposita manifestatione in creatura.[2] Pater enim manifestatur in creatura, sed non mittitur, sed Filius mittitur. Et Gregorius reddit rationem, quia nulla alia causa est, nisi quod iste[3] generatur, ille non, id est Pater.

1. To that, therefore, which (St.) Gregory says: « The Son is sent in that manner, whereby is He generated »; it must be said, that he speaks, having presupposed (His) manifestation in a creature.[2] For the Father is manifested in a creature, but is not sent, but the Son is sent. And (St.) Gregory reckons [reddit rationem], that there is no other cause, except that That of His[3] is generated, (and) He, that is, the Father, (is) not.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur de Beda, dicendum, quod Beda loquitur de processione Spiritus sancti, prout est in creatura, et ita semper est temporalis ut missio.

2. To that which is objected concerning (St.) Bede, it must be said, that (St.) Bede speaks of the procession of the Holy Spirit, insofar as it is in a creature, and thus it is always temporal, as a mission.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod omne quod active et passive ponitur, in Deo est aeternum; dicendum, quod verum est, nisi habeat ulteriorem respectum ad creaturam; sed missio praeter respectum, qui est mittentis ad missum, importat aliquem effectum in creatura.[4]

3. To that which is objected, that everything which is posited actively and passively, in God, is eternal; it must be said, that it is true, unless it has some further regard to a creature; but mission besides the respect, which is of the One sending to the One sent, conveys some effect in the creature.[4]

Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod missio active et passive est Deus; dicendum, quod est quaedam actio, quae solum respicit passum, ut « percutio te »; quaedam, quae passum et alium terminum, ut « doceo te grammaticam », similiter et « mitto te ad

To that which is objected, that mission (in God), actively and passively (said), is God; it must be said, that there is a certain action, which looks back to the one alone enduring it, such as « striking you »; a certain one, which (looks back) to the one enduring it

illum ». Et quod obiicit[5] verum est in actione et passione, quae nihil aliud respiciunt nisi principium et obiectum; sed non in aliis, quae requirunt alium terminum, et ideo habet instantiam in proposito.

and to another terminus, such as « I am teaching you grammar », similarly also « I am sending you to that place ». And that which it objects[5] is true in the action and passion, which look back to nothing else but to the principle and object; but not in the others, which require another terminus, and for that reason it withstands the proposed.

4. Similiter solvendum est ad sequens, quod verum est, si actio illa omnino terminaretur[6] in Deum.

Sed quod obiicit, quod missio respicit Deum ut terminum ad quem; dicendum, quod si terminus, ad quem est missio, esset solum in ratione *finientis*, verum[7] esset; nunc autem non est sic, sed magis in ratione *suscipientis*.

4. Similarly must it be solved regarding the one following, that it is true, if that action were entirely terminated[6] in God.

But what it objects, that mission looks back to God as its terminus to which; it must be said, that if a terminus, to which there is a mission, would be only in the reckoning *of one finishing*, it would be[7] true; but now it is not so, but rather in the reckoning *of one taking it up*.

5. Ad ultimum obiectum dicendum, quod ibi est paralogismus *accidentis*, sicut hic: omne aes est naturale, statua est aes: ergo etc.; quia quod erat materiae attribuitur statuae ratione artificii. Similiter hic, quod erat divinae essentiae attribuitur missioni ratione connotati.

5. To the last objection it must be said, that there is a circumlocution [paralogismus] *of accident* There, just as in this: ‘every piece of copper is natural, the statue is copper: ergo, etc.’; because what belonged to the matter is attributed to the statues by reason of artifice. Similarly here, because what belonged to the Divine Essence is attributed to mission by reason of the connotation.

SCHOLION.

I. In conclusione omnes conveniunt, etiam ii, qui cum Alex. Hal. statuunt, missionem in suo principali significato dicere quid aeternum, nempe processinem aeternam. Ipse Alex. Hal. (loc. cit) obiectum hic ultimo loco positum sic solvit: « De missione est loqui quantum ad principale significatum et quantum ad connotatum: ratione principalis significati est quid aeternum; ratione connotati est ex tempore. Cum autem aeternum coniungitur temporali in eodem termino, proprie loquendo, debet iudicari temporali, sicut, quando necessarium coniungitur contingenti, totum iudicatur contingens. Ideo in argumento isto est fallacia accidentis: missio est Dues; et Deus est aeternus: ergo missio est aeterna; quia aeternitas, quae est in principali significato missionis, infertur de connotato. Hoc enim nomen *aeternus*, cum sit adiectivum, determinat ipsum terminum et ponit rem suam ratione totalis significati ».

SCHOLIUM

I. In the conclusion all agree, even those, who with Alexander of Hales stated, that “mission” in its principal signified means something eternal, namely, the eternal procession. Alexander of Hales himself (loc. cit.) solves this objection posited here in the last place: « Of mission there is a speaking as much as regards (its) principal signified and as much as regards (its) connotation: by reason of (its) principal signified it is something eternal; by reason of (its) connotation it is on account of time. But when the eternal is conjoined to the temporal in the same terminus, properly speaking, it ought to be judged temporal, just as, when the necessary is conjoined with the contingent, the whole is judged contingent. For that reason in that argument there is a fallacy of accident: ‘mission is God; and God is eternal: therefore mission is eternal’; because eternity, which is in the (thing) principally signified by mission, is inferred from what is connoted. For this noun “*eternity*”, when it is an adjective, determines the terminus itself and posits its own meaning by reason

of its whole signified ».

II. Quoa ipsam quaestionem: Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 71. m. 4. — S. Thom., hic q. 4. a. 3; S. I. q. 43. a. 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 4. a. 3. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic d. 15. p. II. prima princ. q. 3. — Dionys. Cath., hic q. 2.

II. As regards the question itself: Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 71, m. 4. — St. Thom as, here in q. 4, a. 3; Summa., i, q. 43, a. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 4, a. 3. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here in d. 15, p. II, first princ., q. 3. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 2.

[1] Sequimur lectionem maioris partis codd. ut A F G K S T V X Y cc ee ff et ed. 1, dum Vat. nomini *Terminus* praefigit *sed*, aliqui vero codd. ut I Z bb *et*, nonnulli demum ut H W post *Terminus* addunt *autem*. Mox post *dicat* cod. B adiungit *missi*, sed nimis arcte videtur.
[2] Postulantibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, substituimus *creatura* loco *creaturis*.
[3] Nempe: Filius. — Vat. cum cod. cc minus congrue et contra alios codd. et ed. 1 *ille* pro *iste*. Paulo ante plures codd. ut A I T bb cum ed. 1 *quod* loco *quia*, quorum aliqui ut bb et ed. 1 dein post *nisi* ponunt *quia* pro *quod*. — Aliam expositionem verborum Gregorii vide in secunda parte huius distinctionis, dub. 2.
[4] Haec solutio respicit minorem tertiae et etiam maiorem quartae obiectionis, sed quod sequitur solvit maiorem tertiae obiectionis.
[5] Vat. *obiicitur*.
[6] Plures codd. ut A I S T cum ed. 1 *terminetur*. Paulo ante cod. W omittit *illa*.
[7] Fide mss. et ed. 1 delevimus *sic*, quod Vat. vocabulo *verum* praefigit. — Nota, quod haec solutio respicit illam obiectionem, quae sub *Contra* in quarta principali continentur.

[1] We follow the reading of the majority of the codices, such as A F G K S T V X Y cc ee ff and edition 1, while the Vatican omitting the final period of the previous sentences, adds at the beginning of this one *but* [sed], however the other codices, such as I Z bb add *and* [et], and not a few, such as H and W, add *but* [autem: after terminus in the Latin text]. Then after *does not mean* [non dicat] codex B adds *that there is sent* [mitti], but this seems exceedingly strict of a reading.
[2] As required by the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *as a creature* [in creatura] in place of *among creatures* [creaturis].
[3] Namely: the Son. — The Vatican edition together with codex cc less congruously and contrary to the other codices and edition 1, has *the One* [ille] for *That of His* [iste]. A little before this after *reckons* [reddit rationem] very many codices, such as A I T bb together with edition 1, have *that* [quod] for *that* [quia], some of which, such as bb and edition 1, then after *except* [nisi] have *that* [quia] for *that* [quod]. — See the other exposition of the words of (St.) Gregory in the second part of this distinction, dubium 2.
[4] This solution respects the minor of the third and even the major of the fourth objection, but what follows solves the major of the third objection.
[5] The Vatican edition has *is objected* [obiicitur].
[6] Very many codices, such as A I S and T together with edition 1, have *is terminated* [terminetur]. A little before this codex W omits *that* [illa].
[7] Trusting the manuscripts and edition 1, we have deleted the *in this manner* [sic], which the Vatican has inserted at this point. — Note, that this solution respects that objection, which is contained in the *Contrary* of the first n. 4.

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

PARS I.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 262-264.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

PART I

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 262-264.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum missio, passive accepta, sit totius Trinitatis, in specie Patris.

TERTIOQUAERITUR, cuius sit missio *ut missi*. Et videtur, quod sit totius Trinitatis.

1. Augustinus quarto de Trinitate:[8] « Mittitur Filius, cum ex tempore cuiusquam mente percipitur ». Sed tota Trinitas ex tempore mente percipitur: ergo tota Trinitas mittitur: ergo et Pater.

2. Item, *mitti* personam est ipsam de novo venire ad habitandum;[9] sed tota Trinitas de novo . . .

[8] Cap. 20. n. 28. — In fine argumenti post *ergo* ex aliquibus mss. ut H Q X adiecimus particulam *et*.
[9] Codd. aa bb melius *inhabitandum*.

QUESTION 3

Whether mission, passively accepted, belongs to the whole Trinity, in view of the Father.

SECOND THRE IS ASKED, to whom does mission belong *as to the One sent*. And it seems, that it belongs to the whole Trinity.

1. (St.) Augustine in the fourth (book) On the Trinity[8] (says): « The Son is sent, when in time He is perceived by the mind of anyone ». But the whole Trinity is perceived by the mind in time: therefore the whole Trinity is sent: therefore also the Father.

2. Likewise, '*that a person be sent*' is 'that he come to dwell[9] anew'; but the whole Trinity comes anew . . .

[8] Chapter 20, n. 28. — At the end of the argument after *therefore* [ergo], we have inserted, from some manuscripts, such as H Q and X, the particle *also* [et].
[9] Codices aa and bb have better *indwell* [inhabitandum].

---

p. 263

venit ad habitandum in peccatore, cum gratia datur ei: ergo etc. *Minor* patet, Ioannis decimo quarto:[1] *Ad eum veniemus* etc.

comes anew to dwell in the sinner, when grace is given to him: ergo etc.. *The minor* is clear, according to the fourteenth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[1] *We*

shall come to him etc..

3. Item, missio connotat effectum in creatura; sed regula[2] est, quod omne nomen connotas effectum dicitur essentialiter: ergo missio, passive dicta, dicitur essentialiter; sed quod essentialiter dicitur convenit toti Trinitati: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, "mission" connotes an effect in the creature; but the rule[2] is, that every word [nomen] connoting an effect is said essentially: therefore "mission", passively said, is said essentially; but what is said essentially befits the whole Trinity: ergo etc..

4. Item, quando aliquid mittitur, mittitur cum eo omne quod ei[3] in separabiliter est coniunctum; sed Pater est inseparabiliter coniunctus Filio: ergo quando mittitur Filius, mittitur et Pater.

4. Likewise, when anything is sent, there is sent with it everything which is inseparably conjoined to it;[3] but the Father is inseparably conjoined to the Son: therefore when the Son is sent, the Father is also sent.

5. Item, *mittere* et *mitti* aut sunt aequalis nobilitatis, aut non. Si *aequalis*: ergo qua ratione dicitur *mittere* de Patre, eadem ratione et *mitti*; si[4] *inaequalis*: ergo mittens est maior misso: ergo Filius est inaequalis Patri.

5. Likewise, '*to send*' and '*to be sent*' either are of equal nobility, or (are) not. If *of equal*, therefore, for the reason for which "*to send*" is said of the Father, for the same reason also "*to be sent*": if[4] *of unequal*: therefore the One sending is greater than the One sent: therefore the Son is unequal to the Father.

Contra: 1. Augustinus secundo de Trinitate:[5] « Pater nusquam legitur missus »; sed non debemus aliquid asserere de Deo, quod non habemus ex Scriptura: ergo mitti non convenit toti Trinitati.

On the contrary: 1. (St.) Augustine in the second (book) On the Trinity[5] (says): « Never is the Father read (to have been) "sent" »; but we ought not assert anything of God, which we do not have from Scripture: therefore "to be sent" does not befit the whole Trinity.

2. Item, Augustinus[6] dicit, quod Pater absurdissime dicitur missus; sed sermones veri non sunt absurdissimi, sed potius falsi: ergo mitti non vere dicitur de Patre.

2. Likewise, (St.) Augustine[6] says, that the Father most absurdly is said (to have been) "sent", but true sayings [sermones] are not most absurd; but rather false: therefore "to be sent" is not truly said of the Father.

3. Item, Augustinus[7] dicit, quod mitti est cognosci esse ab alio; sed Pater non cognoscitur esse ab alio: ergo Pater non mittitur.

3. Likewise, (St.) Augustine[7] says, that "to be sent" is "to be cognized to be from another"; but the Father is not cognized to be from another: therefore the Father is not sent.

4. Item, omne mobile reducitur ad immobile,[8] ergo missibile ad immissibile: ergo in divinis est aliqua persona immissibilis, sed non nisi Pater. ergo etc.

4. Likewise, every mobile is lead back to the immobile,[8] therefore the sendable to the unsendable: therefore among the divine there is some unsendable Person, but (This is) not but the Father: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Missio, passive accepta, nullatenus dici potest de Patre.

CONCLUSION

Mission, passively accepted, can to no extent be said of the Father.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod missio, sicut patet ex ratione Augustini et melius infra patebit,[9] semper duo habet ex suo intellectu, scilicet emanationem et manifestationem per effectum. Quia ergo

I respond: It must be said, that "mission", as is clear from the reckoning of (St.) Augustine and (as) shall be clear better below,[9] always has two (things) from its own understanding, that is (its) emanation and

importat semper[10] emanationem passive missio passive dicta, hinc est, quod cum Pater omnino careat principio, quod de ipso nullo modo potest dici missio passiva; unde non invenitur, et si inveniretur, esset tanquam falsa et velut impropria exponenda.[11]

manifestation through effect. Therefore, because "mission" passively said (i.e. as 'being sent') always conveys emanation passively, hence it is, that since the Father entirely lacks a beginning, that of Him in no manner can a passive mission be said; whence (such a saying) is not found, and if it were found, it would be as a false (saying) and (would have) to be expounded as if improper.[11]

1. 2. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur primo et secundo,[12] quod missio est perceptio ab intellectu, vel in habitatio de novo; dicendum, quod non dicit totam rationem missionis, sed solum a parte *termini in*[13] *quem*; unde debet addi cum illis *emanatio ab alio*; et tunc non valet.

1. 2. To that, therefore, which is objected first and second,[12] that mission is a perception by the intellect, and/or a dwelling anew; it must be said, that (each) does not recount [non dicit] the whole reckoning of mission, but only on the part of *the terminus unto*[13] *which*; whence there ought to be added with these *the emanation from another*, and then (each argument) is not valid.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur tertio, quod connotat[14] effectum, ergo est essentiale; dicendum, quod nomen connotas effectum aut dicit solum respectum ad effectum, et tunc est pure essentiale, ut *creare*, aut dicit etiam cum hoc respectum ad personam, et sic potest esse notionale, sicut *creare per Filium* solius est Patris. Sic est de hoc quod est *mitti*, quia non dicit tantum comparationem missi ad suscipientem[15] effectum, sed etiam ad principium. Significat enim, ipsum esse ab alio et in alium; et sic patet illud.

3. To that which is objected third, that it connotes[14] an effect, therefore it is essential; it must be said, that a word [nomen] connoting an effect either means only a looking-back to the effect, and then is purely essential, such as "*to create*", or means also, with this, a looking-back to a person, and thus can be notional, just as "*to create through the Son*" belongs to the Father alone. In this manner it concerns that it is "*to be sent*", because it does not only mean a comparison of the one sent to the one taking-up[15] the effect, but also to the principle. For it signifies, that it is from another and in another; and in this manner that (objection) is clear.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod inseparabilia simul mittuntur; dicendum, quod illud est verum de illa missione, quae est per separationem; sed de illa missione, quae est per distinctionem, non est dicere, quod simul[16] mittantur necessario illi qui distinguuntur, sicut nec in alia missione illa quae separantur. Et quoniam Pater distinguitur a Filio, et missio in divinis dicit distinctionem; ideo non oportet, quod cum mittitur[17] Filius, mittatur Pater.

4. To that which is objected, that inseparables are sent together: it must be said, that that is true of that mission, which is through separation; but of that mission, which is through distinction, it is not that one says, that those which are distinguished are sent together,[16] just as neither are those which are separated in the other mission. And since the Father is distinguished from the Son, 'mission' in the divine means distinction; for that reason it is not required [non oportet], that when the Son is sent,[17] the Father be sent.

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur ultimo, quod aequalis nobilitatis est *mitti* ut[18] *mittere*; dicendum, quod *mitti* non removetur a Patre, quia dicit ignobilitatem, sed quia dicit emanationem et subauctoritatem, quae

5. To that which is objected, that of an equal nobility is '*to be sent*' as (is) [18] '*to send*'; it must be said, that '*to be sent*' is not removed from the Father, because it means ignobility, but because it means the

quamvis non sit ignobilitatis, tamen non convenit Patri.[19]

---

[1] Vers. 23.
[2] Vat. cum cod. cc *ita* loco *regula*, sed obstat auctoritas aliorum codd. et ed. 1. Mox post *omne* ex pluribus codd. ut H M Y aa bb ff cum ed. 1 adiecimus *nomen*, quod et infra in responsione habetur ab omnibus mss. Dein ed. 1 *notans* loco *connotans*.
[3] Ex mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus indebite omissum *ei*, et paulo infra post *coniunctus* expunximus *cum*, loco cuius cod. W ponit *ipsi*.
[4] Vat., plurimis mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, addit *est*.
[5] Cap. 5. n. 8. Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 2.
[6] Libr. IV. de Trin. c. 21. n. 32; vide hic in lit. Magistri, c. 9.
[7] Libr. IV. de Trin. c. 20. n. 28; vide hic in lit. Magistri, c. 7-9.
[8] Cfr. Aristot., VIII. Phys. text. 34. seqq. (c. 5.). — Mox post primum *ergo* cod. M. cum ed. 1 adiicit *et*. Paulo infra fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1, 4, 5 substituimus *aliqua* pro minus apte *alia*.
[9] Quaest. seq. in corp. et ad 3. — Mox nonnulli codd. ut aa bb ff cum ed. 1 *de* loco *ex*, et dein cod. Y post *emanationem* explicative addit *passive*.
[10] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *semper*, et mox post *missio* ope plurium mss. ut A H I M T V aa bb ff supplevimus *passive*, qua lectione omnis ambiguitas tollitur. Ed. 1 omittit primum *passive*.
[11] Praeferenda videtur lectio cod. T, in qua post *esset* addita particula *tanquam* deest, utpote quae verbo *exponenda* non bene adaptatur, pro qua unus alterve codex habet *inquam*. Cod. X *valde* loco *velut*. Cod. K *velut haeretica reprobanda* pro *velus imporpria exponenda*.
[12] Licet mss. cum ed. 1 omittant *et secundo*, retinuimus tamen, quia revera ad duo prima obiecta respondetur.
[13] Cod. T *ad*. In fine solutionis codd. L O loco *non valet* legunt *vera est*.
[14] Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 *notat*.
[15] Cod. R *susceptionem seu*. In fine reponsionis fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 post *patet* adiecimus *illud*.
[16] Auctoritate antiquiorum codd. et ed. 1 substituimus *simul* pro *sic*. Paulo ante codd. N R *verum* loco *dicere*. Cod. X praecedentem propositionem ita exhibet: *missione non est verum, quae est per distinctionem, non enim est dicere*. Paulo infra sub *alia missione* intellige illam, *quae est per separationem*, in qua *inseparabilia simul* mittuntur, *separata* vero *non*.
[17] Vat. cum aliquibus mss. *mittatur*, sed minus apte. Cod. T *si* loco *cum*. Mox post *mittatur* cod. Z addit *et*.
[18] Ed. 1 *et* loco *ut*.
[19] In cod. K additur *imo repugnat proprietati eius, quia Pater est non ab alio*.

emanation and subauthorship, which though it does not belong to ignobility, yet it does not befit the Father.[19]

---

[1] Verse 23.
[2] The Vatican edition together with codex cc has *thus it* [ita] in place of *the rule* [regula], but contrary to the authority of the other codices and edition 1. Then after *every* [omne], we have inserted, from very many codices, such as H M Y aa bb and ff, together with edition 1, *word* [nomen], which is also had below in the response in all the manuscripts. Then edition 1 has *noting* [notans] in place of *connoting* [connotans].
[3] From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied the unduly omitted *to it* [ei], and a little below this after *conjoined* [coniunctus], we have expunged the *with* [cum], in place of which codex W had *Himself* [ipsi]
[4] The Vatican edition, disagreeing with very many manuscripts and edition 1, adds *it is* [est].
[5] Chapter 5, n. 8. See the text of Master (Peter) here in ch. 2.
[6] On the Trinity, Bk. IV, ch. 21, n. 32; see the text of Master (Peter) here in ch. 9.
[7] On the Trinity, Bk. IV, ch. 20, n. 28; see the text of Master (Peter) here in chs. 7-9.
[8] Cf. Aristotle, Physics, Bk. VIII, text 34 ff. (ch. 5). — Then after the first *therefore* [ergo] codex M together with edition 1 inserts *also* [et]. A little below this, trusting in very many manuscripts and editions 1, 4 and 5, we have substituted *some* [aliqua] for the less apt *another* [alia].
[9] The following Question, in the body of the response, and in reply to n. 3. — Then not a few codices, such as aa bb and ff, together with edition 1, have *concerning* [de] in place of *from* [de], and then codex Y after *emanation* [emanationem] adds for explication *passively* [passive].
[10] From the more ancient manuscripts, such as A H I M T V aa bb and ff, we have supplied *passively* [passive], by which reading all ambiguity is removed. Edition 1 omits the first *passively* [passive].
[11] The reading of codex T seems to be preferred, *it would be false and (woud have) to be expounded as if improper* [esset falsa et velut impropria exponenda], since *to be expounded* [exponenda] does not fit so well, in place of which one or the other codex has *it would be false and as if improper, I say* [esset falsa et velut impropria inquam].
[12] Though the manuscripts together with edition 1 omit *and second* [et secundo], we nevertheless retain it, because the response here is for the two first objections.
[13] Codex T has *to* [ad]. At the end of the solution codices L and O in place of *is not valid* [non valet] read *is true* [est vera].
[14] Very many codices together with edition 1 have *notes* [notat].
[15] Codex R has *taking-up of or* [susceptionem seu]. At the end of the response, trusting in very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *that (objection)* [illud].
[16] On the authority of the more ancient codices and

edition 1, we have substituted *together* [simul] for *in this manner* [sic]. A little before this codices N and R have *true* [verum] for *that one says* [dicere]. Codex X exhibits the preceding proposition thus: *. . . mission it is not true, which is through distinction, for it is not that one says* [missione non est verum, quae est per distinctionem, non enim est dicere]. A little below this by *the other mission* [alia missione] understand that one, *which is through separation*, in which *the inseparables* are sent *together*, but *not separated*.

17 The Vatican edition together with some manuscripts has *be sent* [mittatur], but less aptly. Codex T has *if* [si] in place of *when* [cum]. Then after *be sent* [mittatur] codex Z adds *also* [et].

18 Edition 1 has *and* [et] for *as (is)* [ut].

19 In codex K there is added *nay it is repugnant to His property, because the Father is not from another* [imo repugnat proprietati eius, quia Pater est non ab alio].

---

p. 264

SCHOLION.

Conclusio est sententia communis; communiter etiam conceditur, Patriis convenire *manifestationem* factam in aliquo effectu ipsi appropriato v. g. in aliqua apparitione. Sed quia *missio* praeter hoc connotat in persona missa emanationem, et Pater non emanat, ideo haec eius manifestatio non est missio. Ita Richard., hic a. 2. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 73. m. 2. a. 1. — S. Thom. hic q. 2; S. I. q. 43. a. 4. — B. Albert., hic a. 7. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 3. a. 3. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1. — Durand., de hac et seq. hic q. 3. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1.

SCHOLIUM

The conclusion is the sententia communis; it also commonly conceded, that a *manifestation* wrought in some effect appropriated to Him does befit Him, v. g. in some apparition. But because *mission* besides this connotes in the Person sent an emanation, and the Father does not emanate, for that reason this manifestation of His is not a mission. Thus Richard (of Middleton), here in a. 2. q. 1. — Alexander of Hales., Summa., p. I, q. 73, m. 2, a. 1. — St. Thomas, here in q. 2; Summa., I, q. 43, a. 4. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 7. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 3, a. 3. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 2, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here in the 2nd princ, q. 1. — Durandus, on this and the following question, here in q. 3. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1.

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XV.

PARS I.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio IV.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 262-264.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO IV.

Utrum missio, active accepta, sit totius Trinitatis.

Q**UARTO ET ULTIMO** quaeritur, cuius est missio ut mittentis. Et quod sit totius Trinitatis, ostenditur sic.

1. Missio idem est quod temporalis donatio; sed temporaliter dare convenit toti Trinitati, quia tota Trinitas dat Spiritum sanctum, ut dicit Augustinus:[1] ergo etc.

2. Item, Augustinus secundo de Trinitate:[2] « Mitti a Patre Filius sine Spiritu sancto non potuit », ergo missio Filii convenit Spiritui sancto: ergo eadem ratinoe missio sui. *Si dicas*, sicut dicunt quidam, quod illud intelligitur de missione secundum humanam naturam, qua missus est ad praedicandum, secundum illud Isaiae sexagesimo primo:[3] *Ad annuntiandum mansuetis misit me*; non autem de missione secundum divinam naturam; *contra*: missio secundum divinam naturam est missio in mentem, vel in carnem; sed Augustinus intelligit de missione in carnem, unde statim subditur: « Quia Pater intelligitur eum missise, cum fecit ex femina »: ergo constat, quod loquitur de missione secundum divinam

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XV

PART I

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 4

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 262-264.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 4

Whether mission, actively accepted, belongs to the whole Trinity.

F**OURTH AND LAST** there is asked, to whom does mission belong as to the One sending. And that it belongs to the whole Trinity, is shown in this manner:

1. The mission is the same (thing) which the temporal donation (is); but to give temporally befits the whole Trinity, because the whole Trinity gives the Holy Spirit, as (St.) Augustine says:[1] ergo etc..

2. Likewise, (St.) Augustine in the second (book) On the Trinity[2] (says): « The Son cannot be sent by the Father without the Holy Spirit », therefore the sending [missio] of the Son befits the Holy Spirit: therefore for the same reason His own [sending]. *If you say*, just as certain ones say, that the former is understood of the mission according to human nature, by which He was sent to preach, according to that (verse) in the sixty-first (chapter) of Isaiah:[3] *To announce to the meek has He sent Me*; but not of the mission according to the Divine Nature; *on the contrary*: the mission according to the Divine Nature is a mission into mind, and/or into flesh; but (St.) Augustine understands (his own saying) of

naturam.

the mission into flesh, whence he immediately subjoins: « Because the Father is understood to have sent Him, when He wrought (Him) out of a woman »; therefore it is established, that he is speaking of the mission according to the Divine Nature.

3. Item, Magister[4] facit tale argumentum: si Pater potest dare vel mittere Spiritum sanctum, et Spiritus sanctus non potest, ergo aliquid potest Pater, quod non potest Spiritus sanctus. Item si Pater dat et mittit Spiritum sanctum, et hoc non facit Spiritus sanctus, aliquid facit Pater, quod non facit Spiritus sanctus: ergo divisa sunt opera Trinitatis.

3. Likewise, Master (Peter)[4] makes such an argument: if the Father can give and/or send the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit cannot, therefore the Father can do something, which the Holy Spirit cannot. Likewise if the Father gives and sends the Holy Spirit, and this the Holy Spirit does not do, the Father does something, that the Holy Spirit does not do: therefore the work of the Trinity is divided.

Contra: 1. Datum dicitur relative ad dantem, sicut dicit Augustinus quinto de Trinitate:[5] ergo Spiritus sanctus non datur nisi ab his, ad quos relative dicitur; sed non dicitur relative ad se: ergo non dat se, ergo nec mittit se.

On the contrary: 1. The "one given" is said relatively to the "one giving", just as (St.) Augustine says in the fifth (book) On the Trinity:[5] therefore the Holy Spirit is not given except by those, to whom He is relatively said (to be given); but He is not said relatively (to be given) to Himself: therefore He does not give Himself, therefore neither does He send Himself.

2. Item, sicut Pater est prima persona in Trinitate, ante quam non est alia, ita Spiritus sanctus, post quam[6] non est alia; sed Pater, quia non habet peronsam, ex qua sit, nullo modo dicitur missus: ergo cum Spiritus sanctus non habeat personam ex se emanantem, nullo modo dicitur mittere.

2. Likewise, just as the Father is the First Person in the Trinity, before Which there is no Other, so the Holy Spirit, after Which[6] there is no Other; but the Father, because He does not have a Person, from whom He is, is in no manner said (to be) sent: therefore since the Holy Spirit does not have a Person emanating from Himself, He is in no manner said to send.

3. Item, ubicumque est missio passiva, ibi est subauctoritas respectu alicuis principii in misso, sicut dicitur ab Augustino et Magistro:[7] ergo ubi est missio activa, ibi notatur auctoritas respectu personae; sed Spiritus sanctus non habet auctoritatem respectu sui nec alterius personae: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, wheresoever there is a passive mission, there is a subauthorship in respect of some principle in the one sent, just as is said by (St.) Augustine and Master (Peter):[7] therefore where there is an active mission, there is noted an authorship in respect to a Person; but the Holy Spirit does not have an authorship in respect of Himself nor (in respect) of the Other Person: ergo etc..

4. Item, ubicumque est missio, ibi vere notatur distinctio, sicut in creaturis separatio; sed persona Spiritus sancti non distinguitur a se: ergo a se non mittitur nec Filium mittit, cum non habeat auctoritatem in ipsum: ergo non mittit.

4. Likewise, wheresoever there is mission, there is truly noted a distinction, just like [sicut] the separation among creatures; but the Person of the Holy Spirit is not distinguished from Himself. therefore He is not sent by Himself nor does He send the Son, since He does not have an authorship regarding [in] Him: therefore He does not send.

5. Item, omnis actus, secundum quem

5. Likewise, every act, according to which a

persona reflectitur super se, est essentialis et essentialiter dictus; si ergo Filius mittit se, vel Spiritus sanctus[8] se: ergo mittere vel mitti essentialiter dicitur; sed omnis talis actus dicitur de tribus. ergo Pater mittit se.

CONCLUSIO.

Impropria est locutio, quod sive Pater sive Trinitas mittat se; omnino propria, quod persona producens mittat productam; denique minus propria, sed tamen sustinenda, quod personae procedentes mittant se.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod in hac quaestione sapientes opinantur contrarie sapientibus. Nam Magister dicit expresse et nititur probare auctoritate et ratione, quod Spirits sanctus mittit se et dat se;[9] nec oportet secundum ipsum, quod inter mittentem et missum cadat personalis distinctio, sed solum quantum ad rationem intelligendi, ut idem[10] ipse sit mittens in quantum Deus, et idem ipse sit missus in quantum donum.

---

[1] Libr. XV. de Trin. c. 19. n. 36; vide hic in lit. Magistri, c. 1.
[2] Cap. 5. n. 8.
[3] Vers. 1.
[4] Hic, c. 1. — Argumentum hoc Vat. cum cod. cc, sed contra ceteros codd. et ed. 1 nec non lit. Magistri, corrupte exhibet omittendo verba *et Spiritus sanctus* usque *et hoc non facit*.
[5] Cap. 14. n. 15: Quod autem datum est, et ad eum qui dedit refertur etc. Vide infra d. XVIII. lit. Magistri, c. 4.
[6] Subaudi: personam. Ex mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *quam* loco *quem*, quod Vat. minus bene habet.
[7] Hic, c. 9, ubi et verba Augustini reperies. — Paulo infra post *personae* in cod. O explicative additur *missae*.
[8] Cod. I hic repetit *mittit*.
[9] Vat. cum cod. cc *mittat se et det se*.
[10] Vat. cum cod. cc minus bene et contra alios codd. ac ed. 1 omittit *idem*.

Person is turned back [reflectitur] upon Himself, is essential and said essentially; if, therefore, the Son sends Himself, and/or the Holy Spirit (sends) Himself:[8] therefore "to send" and/or "to be sent" is essentially said, but every such act is said of the Three: therefore the Father sends Himself.

CONCLUSION

Improper is the saying, that either the Father or the Trinity sends Itself; entirely proper, that the Person producing sends the One produced; next, less proper, but yet to be sustained, that the Persons proceeding send Themselves.

I **respond:** It must be said, that in this question the wise opine contrariwise to the wise. For Master (Peter) says expressly and strives to prove by authority and reason, that the Holy Spirit sends Himself and gives Himself;[9] and it is necessary (that this) not (be) according to the same (sense), because between the One sending an the One sent there falls a personal distinction, but only as much as regards a reckoning of understanding, so that the very Same[10] be the One sending inasmuch as God, and the very Same be sent inasmuch as gift.

---

[1] On the Trinity, Bk. XV, ch. 19, n. 36; see here in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 1.
[2] Chapter 5, n. 8.
[3] Verse 1.
[4] Here, in ch. 1. — This argument the Vatican edition together with codex cc, but contrary to all the other codices and edition 1, not to mention the text of Master (Peter), exhibits in a corrupt manner, by omitting the words *and the Holy Spirit* all the way to *and this . . . does not do* [et Spiritus sanctus . . . et hoc non facit.]
[5] Chapter 14, n. 15: Moreover because He has been given, and to him who gives is referred etc.. See below, Master (Peter)'s text, d. XVIII, ch. 4.
[6] This quam of the Latin text is to be understood as the relative *Which*, not the comparative particle. From the manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted this in place of *Whom* [quem], which the Vatican has less well [Trans.note: since *Which* refers to the Divine Person as Person, where as *Whom* to the Person as an Individual.]
[7] Here, in ch. 9, where you will also find the words of (St.) Augustine. — A little below this after *to a Person* [personae] codex O adds as an explanation *sent* [missae].
[8] Codex I here repeats *sends* [mittit].
[9] The Vatican edition together with codex cc has this last clause in the subjunctive.
[10] The Vatican edition together with codex cc, less

well and contrary to the other codices and edition 1, reads *so that He be* [ut ipse sit], omitting *Same* [idem].

p. 265

Aliorum magistrorum et antiquorum fuit positio, quod mittere et mitti de ratione sui nominis important subacutoritatem et auctoritatem[1] et distinctionem; et ideo nullo modo potest dici, quod una persona mittat se vel mittatur a se. Unde locutiones istae sunt impropriae et exponendae, quae hoc dicere videntur. Et positionem suam confirmant per Augustinum,[2] qui dicit, quod Pater nullo modo mittitur nec legitur missus; hoc non est ob aliud, nisi quia hoc quod est *missus* importat subauctoritatem: ergo per oppositum *mittere* importat auctoritatem, et una persona non habet auctoritatem super se. Et respondent rationibus Magistri, quod non est simile de hoc quod est *dare* et de hoc quod est *mittere*. Quia *dare uno* modo est ex liberalitate sive amore communicare, et sic est *essentiale* omnino et nullam connotat distinctionem, et sic conceditur, quod tota Trinitas dat se ipsam, et Pater similiter. *Alio* modo *dare* est alicui donum communicare, non tantum ex liberalitate, sed etiam ex auctoritate, et sic *dare* dicit notionem sive tenetur *notionaliter*, et hoc modo non valent illae rationes: si Pater dat Spiritum sanctum, et Spiritus sanctus non dat se: ergo aliquid facit Pater, quod non[3] Spiritus sanctus; quia dicit notionem, et in hoc sensu aequipollet ei quod est *mittere*, et similiter donatio passiva ei quod est *procedere*. — Similiter ad *simile*, quod inducit Magister de Filio, dicunt, quod non est simile, quia in Filio duplex est natura, scilicet divina et humana; et quantum ad *humanam* potest mitti et mittitur a tota Trinitate, quia minor est Deo et inferior, et non tantum subauctoritatem habet, sed etiam servitutem, quia est servus Dei, quamvis per unionem sit Deus. Quantum ad *divinam* autem mittitur a solo Patre, quia a solo Patre producitur. Quia ergo Spiritus sanctus producitur et a Patre et a Filio, et non a se ipso, hinc est, quod non mittitur nisi a Patre et a Filio. Et propter hoc rationes Magistri non valent, quia omnes auctoritates, quae dicunt, Filium mitti a Spiritu sancto vel a se, secundum humanum

To other masters and ancients belonged the position, that “to send” and “to be sent” from the reckoning of their name convey a subauthorship and authorship[1] and a distinction; and for that reason it can in no manner be said, that one Person sends Himself and/or is sent by Himself. Therefore those sayings are improper and are to be expounded (as such), which seem to say this. And they confirm their own position through (St.) Augustine,[2] who says, that the Father in no manner is sent nor is read (to have been) “sent”; this is not because of the other, except because that which has been “*sent*” conveys a subauthorship: therefore per oppositum “*to send*” conveys an authorship, and one Person does not have an authorship over Himself. And they respond to the reasons of Master (Peter), that it is not similar concerning that which is “*to give*” and concerning that which is “*to send*”. Because “*to give*” in *one* manner is “to communicate out of liberality or love”, and thus is entirely *essential* and connotes no distinction, and in this manner it is conceded, that the whole Trinity gives Itself, and the Father similarly. In *another* manner “*to give*” is “to communicate a gift to someone”, not only out of liberality, but also out of authorship, and thus “*to give*” means the notion or is held *notionally*, and in this manner those reasons are not valid: ‘if the Father gives the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit does not give Himself: therefore the Father does something, which the Holy Spirit (does)[3] not’; because it means the notion, and in this sense it is equipollent to that which is “*to send*”, and, similarly, passive donation to that which is “*to proceed*”. — Similarly regarding the *similar* (argument), which Master (Peter) brings forward concerning the Son, they say, that it is not similar, because in the Son there is a twofold nature, that is the Divine and the human; and as much as regards the *human* He can be sent and is sent by the whole Trinity, because it is less than God and inferior, and not only has a subauthorship,

naturam intelligunter.

but also a servitude, because (Christ) is the servant of God, although through (the hypostatic) union He is God. But, as much as regards the *Divine* (Nature) He is sent by the Father alone, because He is produced by the Father alone. Therefore, because the Holy Spirit is produced by the Father and by the son, and not by Himself, hence it is, that He is not sent but by the Father and by the Son. And on account of this the reasons of Master (Peter) are not valid, because all the authorities which say, that the Son is sent by the Holy Spirit and/or by Himself, are understood of the human nature.

Sed licit haec positio rationabilior videatur et facilior ad sustinendum, tamen — quia non debemus auctoritates Sanctorum trahere ad nostram rationem, sed magis e converso rationem nostram auctoritatibus Sanctorum subiicere, ubi non continent expressam absurditatem; et Sancti dicunt, et Magister dicit, et maxime Augustinus, qui plus super hac materia locutus est, Filium mitti a Spiritu sancto et etiam[4] a se, quod non possunt exponere secundum humanam naturam — *ideo* alia positio tum ob reverentiam Sanctorum, tum ob reverentiam Magistri videtur magis esse tenenda. Illud enim[5] verbum Augustini, quod dicit, quod Filius est missus in carnem a Spiritu sancto, secundum humanam naturam nullo modo potest intelligi, ut videtur, quia missio haec fuit ad humanitatis sive carnis assumptionem: ergo secundum rationem intelligendi praecedit humanam naturam ut iam unitam: ergo si Filius hoc modo dicitur missus, oportet quod attribuatur divinae naturae, et ita ratione divinae naturae missus est a Spiritu sancto; multo fortius igitur et[6] *a se*, ac per hoc et Spiritus sanctus *a se*.

But though this position seems more reasonable and easier to sustain, yet — because we ought not draw the authorities of the Saints to our reckoning, but rather the other way around subject our reckoning to the authorities of the Saints, where they do not contain an express absurdity; and (because) the Saints say, and Master (Peter) says, and most of all (St.) Augustine, who has spoken more on this matter, that the Son is sent by the Holy Spirit and even[4] by Himself, which they cannot expound according to the human nature — *for that reason* the other position both on account of reverence for the Saints, and on account of reverence for Master (Peter) seems rather to be held. For[5] that word of (St.) Augustine, which says, that the Son has been sent into flesh by the Holy Spirit, can in no manner be understood according to the human nature, as is seen, because this mission was for the assumption of a humanity or of the flesh: therefore according to the reckoning of understanding it precedes 'the human nature as already united': therefore if the Son is in this manner said (to be) sent, it is bound to be attributed to the Divine Nature, and thus by reason of the Divine Nature He has been sent by the Holy spirit; much more strongly, therefore, also *by Himself*, and through this (line of reasoning) even[6] the Holy Spirit *by Himself*.

Et propterea ad intelligentiam obiectorum in contrarium notandum est, quod *missio* de se duo importat, scilicet *emanationem* et *manifestationem*, et principaliter[7] de ratione suae significationis importat manifestationem. Et hoc patet per Augustinum in quarto de Trinitate, qui dicit,

And on this account for an understanding of the objections in the Contrary it must be noted, that "*mission*" of itself conveys two (things), that is *emanation* and *manifestation*, and principally[7] from the reckoning of its own signification conveys a manifestation. And this is clear through (St.)

quod *mitti* est *cognosci esse ab alio*, et habetur in praesenti distinctione,[8] quod « tunc Filius mittitur, cum ex tempore cuiusquam mente percipitur ». Quia ergo principaliter importat manifestationem et connotat in misso emanationem, ideo *manifestatio* significatur per hoc quod est *mittere* per modum actionis, et per hoc quod est *mitti* per modum passionis; sed *emanatio* utrobique uniformiter. Unde sensus est: Pater mittit Filium, id est, declarat sive manifestat Filii emanationem, sive Filium emanare. In passiva vero sensus est: Filius sive Spiritus sanctus mittitur, id est, manifestatur ab alio emanare.

Augustine in the fourth (book) On the Trinity, who says, that "*to be sent*" is "*to be cognized to be from another*", and (as) is had in the present distinction,[8] that « the Son is then sent, when He is perceived in time by the mind of anyone ». Therefore, because it principally conveys a manifestation and connotes an emanation in the one sent, for that reason *manifestation* is signified through that which it is "*to send*" through a manner of action, and through that which it is "*to be sent*" through the manner of passion; but *emanation* (is signified) uniformly in each manner. Whence the sense is: 'the Father sends the son, that is, declares or manifests the emanation of the Son, or that the Son emanates'. On the other hand in the passive, the sense is: 'the Son or the Holy Spirit is sent, that is, is manifested by another to emanate'.

Et quoniam ablativus respectu passivi, et nominativus respectu verbi[9] activi important rationem principii, et significatio huius verbi *mittere* et *mitti* est *manifestatio* et *emanatio*; ideo illa est *propriissima*, quando ablativus vel nominativus importat habitudinem principii respectu utriusque, ut cum dicitur: Pater mittit Filium, et Filius mittitur a Patre, quia Filius emanat a Patre et manifestatur a Patre.

And since the ablative in respect to a passive (verb), and the nominative in respect to an active verb[9] convey the reckoning of a principle, and the signification of this verb "*to send*" and "*to be sent*" is a *manifestation* and an *emanation*, for that reason it is *most proper*, when the ablative and/or the nominative convey a habitude of principle in respect to each, as when there is said: "the Father sends the Son", and "the Son is sent by the Father", because the Son emanates from the Father and is manifested by the Father.

Quia vero principale significatum horum verborum est manifestatio, non emantio, quando[10] nominativus vel ablativus est principium *manifestationis*, quamvis non *emanationis*, *propria* est, sed *minus* quam praedicta; et in hoc sensu concedun- /-tur . . .

On the other hand, because the principal (thing) signified by these words is a manifestation, not an emanation, when[10] the nominative and/or ablative is the principle *of the manifestation*, although not *of the emanation*, it is *proper*, but *less* than the aforesaid, and in this sense are conceded . . .

---

[1] Ed. 1, transpositis verbis, *auctoritatem et subauctoritatem*.
[2] Libr. II. de Trin. c. 5. n. 8. Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 2.
[3] In cod. T hic repetitur *facit*. Mox post *mittere* adiecimus ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 particulam *et*.
[4] In Vat. et cod. cc perperam deest *etiam*, quod tamen in aliis codd. et ed. 1 habetur. Paulo ante ed. 1 *hanc materiam* pro *hac materia*.
[5] In cod. T pro particula *enim* a secunda manu positum est *tamen*.
[6] Ex multis mss. ut A G I K P Q T V X Y aa ee ff et ed. 1 adiunximus non bene omissum *et*.

[1] Edition 1, having transposed the words, has *authorship and subauthorship* [auctoritatem et subauctoritatem].
[2] On the Trinity, Bk. II, ch. 5, n. 8. See there the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2.
[3] In codex T there is here repeated *does* [facit]. Then after *to send* [mittere] we have inserted from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 the particle *and* [et].
[4] In the Vatican edition and codex cc there is faultily absent *even* [etiam], which however is had in the other codices and edition 1. A little before this edition one has *upon this matter* [super hanc

[7] Cod. Y *principalius*.
[8] Cap. 7-9. — Mox fide vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *quod* pro *quia*.
[9] Vat., antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, omittit *verbi*, quod et ed. 1 paulo ante voci *passivi* praefigit. Paulo infra cod. O *ista locutio* loco *illa*.
[10] Vat. cum aliquibus codd. perperam *quoniam* loco *quando*. Paulo infra post *minus* ex aliquibus tantum codd. ut G H Z et ed. 1 adiecimus *quam* abmiguitatis tollendae gratia.

materiam] for *on this matter* [super hac materia].
[5] In codex T for the particle *For* [enim] there is placed by a second hand *However* [tamen].
[6] From many manuscripts, such as A G I K P Q T V X Y aa ee and ff and edition 1, we have inserted the not well omitted *even* [et].
[7] Codex Y *more principally* [principalius].
[8] Chapters 7-9. — Then trusting in the older manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *that* [quod] for *that* [quia].
[9] The Vatican edition, striving against the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, omits *verb* [verbi], which even edition 1 prefixes a little before this to the word *passive* [passivi].
[10] The Vatican edition together with some codices faultily has *since* [quoniam] in place of *when* [quando]. A little below this after *less* [minus], from only some of the codices, such as G H Z and edition 1., we have inserted *than* [quam], for the sake of removing the ambiguity.

---

p. 264

concedun- /-tur istae: Filius mitti se, et Spiritus sanctus mittit se.

those of his : "The Son sends Himself", and "The Spirit sends Himself".

Quia vero tam *mittere* quam *mitti* important emanationem circa missum, et persona Patris non emanat ab aliquo, similiter nec Trinitas: ideo persona Patris nusquam legitur missa nec ipsa Trinitas.

On the other hand, because both "*to send*" and "*to be sent*" convey an emanation about the one sent, and the Person of the Father does not emanate from anyone, similarly neither the Trinity. for the reason the Person of the Father is never read (to have been) "sent" nor (is) the Trinity Itself.

Ex hoc patet, quod haec est simpliciter et *omnino propria*: Pater mittit Filium; haec est *minus propria*, tamen a proprietate non receidt: Filius mittit se; haec autem *omnino impropria*: Pater mittit se sive ipsa Trinitas.[1]

From this it is clear, that this (statement) is simply and *entirely proper*: "The Father sends the Son"; this one is *less proper*, yet does not recede from propriety: "the Son sends Himself"; but this one (is) *entirely improper*. "the Father sends Himself" or "the Trinity Itself (sends Itself)".[1]

1. Ad illud quod obiicitur in contrarium de dato, quod dicitur relative; dicendum, quod verum est, secundum quod *dare* dicit per quandam auctoritatem communicare; hoc modo non accipit Magister, sed in quantum *dare* idem est quod liberaliter et voluntarie communicare.

1. To that which is objected in the Contrary concerning one given, that it is said relatively; it must be said, that it is true, according to which "*to give*" means 'to communicate through a certain authorship'; in this manner Master (Peter) does not accept it, but (he does) inasmuch as "*to give*" is the same as "to communicate liberally and voluntarily".

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Pater non mittitur, quia non est[2] ab alio; dicendum, quod non est simile, quia tam *mittere* quam *mitti* important emanationem in misso, ut patet exponenti. Sensus enim est: haec persona mittit illam, id est, manifestat eius emanationem; et: haec mittitur ab illa, id est, eius emanatio manifestatur ab illa. Sed haec emanatio non semper importatur

2. To that which is objected, that the Father is not sent, because He is[2] not from another; it must be said, that it is not similar, because both *to send* and *to be sent* convey an emanation in the one sent, as is clear to the one expounding (it). For the sense is: 'this person sends that one', that is, 'he manifests the emanation of him'; and: 'this one is sent by that one', that is,

respectu[3] omnis personae mittentis, quia ab aliquo potest esse manifestatio emanationis, a quo tamen non est ipsa emanatio; et ideo sic non ponitur *productio* in *mittente*, sicut *emanatio* in *misso*; et ideo non sequitur, quodsi Pater non mittitur, quod Spiritus sanctus non mittat.[4]

'his emanation is manifested by that one'. But this emanation does not always convey a looking-back[3] to every Person sending, because from Anyone there can be a manifestation of an emanation, from Whom, however, there is not the emanation itself; and for that reason *production* is not in this manner posited in *the One sending*, just as *emanation* (is) in the *One sent*; and for that reason it does not follow, that if the Father is not sent, that the Holy Spirit does not send.[4]

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur: ubi est missio passiva, ibi est subauctoritas; dicendum, quod verum est, non ratione, qua passivum, sed ea ratione, qua tam passivum quam activum notat emanationem in misso, sicut patuit in expositione.[5] Et quia emanatio non semper est respectu mittentis, ideo non oportet, quod semper importetur auctoriatas in mittente, sed ratio ista valeret bene, si ita esset, ut principale significatum eius quod est *missio* esset emanatio sive productio.

3. To that which is objected: where there is a passive mission, there is a subauthorship; it must be said, that it is true, not by the reckoning, by which (it has a) passive (sense), but by that reckoning, by which both the passive and the active (sense) note an emanation in the One sent, just as was clear in the exposition.[5] And because an emanation is not always in respect to the One sending, for that reason it is not necessary [non oportet], that there always be conveyed an authorship in the One sending, but that reckoning would well be valid, if it were thus, that the principle (thing) signified of that which *mission* is were an emanation or a production.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod *mittere* importat distinctionem; dicendum, quod *mittere uno* modo importat *differentiam substantialem*, ut cum importat dominium, ut cum dicitur: Deus mittit Angelum; *alio* modo *distinctionem personalem*, ut cum importat auctoritatem in mittente et subauctoritatem in misso respectu mittentis, ut cum dicitur: Pater mittit Filium. *Tertio* modo importat distinctionem solum quantum ad *modum intelligendi*; sicut cum dicitur: voluntas est instrumentum se ipsum movens — quia idem est movens et motum — sic,[6] cum dicitur: Spiritus sanctus mittit se, idem est mittens et missum, ratione differens: *mittens*, inquam, secundum quod Deus, sed *missum* secundum quod donum, sicut praedictum est.[7]

4. To that which is objected, that "*to send*" conveys a distinction; it must be said, that "*to send*" in *one* manner conveys *a substantial difference*, as when it conveys dominion, as where there is said: "God sends the Angel"; in *another* manner *a personal distinction*, as when it conveys an authorship in the one sending and a subauthorship in the one sent in respect to the one sending, as when there is said: "the Father sends the Son". In a *third* manner it conveys only a distinction as much as regards a *manner of understanding*; just as when there is said: "the will is an instrument moving itself" — because the same is moving and moved — so,[6] when there is said: "the Holy Spirit sends Himself", the Same is the One sending and the One sent, differing (only) in reckoning: "*the One sending*", I say, according to which (He is) God, but "*the One sent*" according to which (He is) gift, just as has be said before.[7]

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur ultimo de reflexione actus, dicendum, quod verum est quoad principale significatum, sed non

5. To that which is objected last concerning the reflection of acting, it must be said, that it is true in regard to the principal (thing)

oportet quantum ad connotatum, et ratione principalis significati est reflexio personae mittentis supra se, ut dicatur: mittens est missus.

SCHOLION.

I. Secunda opinio in corp. recensita est Gulielmi Antissiodorensis. Solutio huius quaestionis, ut bene observat S. Doctor (hic ad 3.), dependet a solutione alterius quaestionis, (supra q. 1. in Scholio), scilicet quid sit principale significatum missionis divinae, utrum *processio*, an processionis *manifestatio*. Haec enim manifestatio est actio tribus personis communis, et si hoc, tunc consequenter *mittere* secundum principale significatum est aliquid essentiale, non notionale, sicut e contra est *mitti*. Ex his principiis sequuntur alia corollaria.

II. Notabile est principium Seraphici in corp. expressum, quod tanquam inviolabilem regulam semper observat, scilicet: « Non debemus auctoritates Sanctorum ad nostram trahere rationem, sed magis e converso rationem nostram auctoritatibus Sanctorum subiicere, ubi non continent expressum absurditatem ».*

III. S. Thomas et in Comment. et in Summa concordat; item Petr. a Tar. « etiam in verbis », ut dicit Dionys. Carth. Ceteri magistri saltem in principali conclusione consentiunt; tamen Aegid. R. *rationes* S. Thomae impugnat. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 72. m. 1. a. 1. 2. 3. — S. Thom., hic q. 3. a. 1. 2; S. I. q. 43. a. 8. — B. Albert., hic a. 5. 9. 11. — Petr. a. Tar., hic q. 2. a. 1; q. 3. a. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 3. q. 1. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1. 2.

---

* [Traductoris. nota: Ed. Quaracchi notitiam istam faciunt contra undam Modernismi, quae in dies suorum inceperat supplantare doctrinam catholicam

signified, but is not necessary [oportet] as much as regards the (thing) connoted, and by reason of the principal (thing) signified there is a reflection of the Person sending upon Himself, such as where there is said [ut dicatur]: "the One sending is sent".

SCHOLIUM

I. The second opinion in the body (of the response) is considered to be that of William of Auxerre. The solution of this question, as the Seraphic Doctor (here in reply to n. 3) rightly observes, depends upon the solution of the other question (q. 1 above, in the Scholium), namely, "What is the principal (thing) signified by a divine mission, *a procession*, or *the manifestation* of a procession?" For this manifestation is an action common to the Three Persons, and if (it is) this, then consequently "*to send*" according to (its) principal signification is something essential, not notional, just as contrariwise *to be sent* is. From these principles the other corollaries follow.

II. Noteworthy is the principle expressed by the Seraphic (Doctor) in the body (of the Response), which is to be observed always as an inviolable rule, namely: « We ought not draw the authorities of the Saints to our reckoning, but rather the other way around subject our reckoning to the authorities of the Saints, where they do not contain an express absurdity ».*

III. St. Thomas both in his <u>Commentary</u> and in his <u>Summa</u> agrees; likewise (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, « even in the same words », as (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian reports. All the other masters agree at least in the principal conclusion; however Giles the Roman impugns the *reasons* given by St. Thomas. — Alexander of Hales, <u>Summa</u>., p. I, q. 72, m. 1, a. 1, 2, and . 3. — St. Thomas, here in q . 3, aa. 1 and 2; <u>Summa</u>., I, q. 43, a. 8. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in aa. 5, 9, and 11. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 1; q. 3, a. 1. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 3, qq. 1 and 2. — Giles the Roman, here in the 2nd. princ, q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in qq 1 and 2.

---

* [Trans. note: *authorities* here means *sayings* or *quotes* or *expressions*; the Quaracchi Editors make this remark against the tide of Modernism, which in

in institutionibus clericalis formationis cattolicis, mediante distortationis signifcationium acceptarum in locutionibus theologicis atque assertionis impiae quod Patres, Doctores ac Sancti magis intenderunt novellas fomentandas his hereticibus novis. Cfr. plura de errore et Modernistarum strategematibus dicta a PP. S. Pio, Pascendi dominici gregis.]

[1] Vat. ultimas propositiones corrupte et praeter fidem mss. ita exhibet: *patet, quod haec est simpliciter et omnino impropria: Pater mittit se sive ipsa Trinitas: quia receditur a proprietate personarum et Trinitatis. Illa vero est simpliciter et omnino propria: Pater mittit Filium, cum a nullius proprietate recedatur*. Ed. 1 in eo a codd. discordat, quod post *Filium* ita prosequitur: *et ista similiter: Pater et Filius mittunt Spiritum sanctum; et haec est minus propria: Filius vel Spiritus sanctus mittit se, vel Spiritus sanctus mittit Filium; haec autem omnino impropria* etc.

[2] Multis mss. ut A G H I K N T V X Y Z aa ee ff et ed. 1 postulantibus, adiunximus *est*.

[3] Vat. contra fere omnes codd. et ed. 1 non ita distincte *importat respectum*. Paulo infra post *manifestatio* loco *emanationis* plurimi codd. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 ponunt *missionis*, quod tamen contextui minus respondet.

[4] Vat. cum ed. 1 et uno alterove codice *similiter*, sed male, utpote non corespondens obiectioni.

[5] Hic circa finem responsionis.

[6] Praeferimus lectionem nonnullorum mss. ut R T X Y et ed. 1 pro *similiter* ponendo *sic*, loco cuius multi codd. ut A C F G H I K L O S U W Z etc. minus apte habent *sicut*.

[7] Hic, in corp.

their day had begun to overwhelm the institutions of clerical formation in the Church, by means of distorting the accepted meanings of theological expressions, and impiously asserting that the Fathers and Doctors and Saints has intended rather the novelties which these new heretics were fomenting. Cf. Pope Pius X's, Pascendi Dominici Gregis for more on the error and tactics of the Modernists.]

[1] The Vatican edition exhibits the propositions in a corrupt manner and contrary to the witness of the manuscripts, thus: *it is clear that this is simply and entirely improper: "the Father sends Himself" or "the Trinity Itself (sends Itself)": because it receded from the property of the Persons and of the Trinity. On the other hand this is simply and entirely proper: "the Father sends the Son", since it recedes from the property of None* [patet, quod haec est simpliciter et omnino impropria: Pater mittit se sive ipsa Trinitas: quia receditur a proprietate personarum et Trinitatis. Illa vero est simpliciter et omnino propria: Pater mittit Filium, cum a nullius proprietate recedatur]. Edition 1 discords with the codices in this, that after *the Son* [Filium] it proceeds thus: *and similarly this one: "the Father and the Son send the Holy Spirit"; and this is less proper: "the Son and/or the Holy Spirit sends Himself", and/or "the Holy Spirit sends the Son"; but this is entirely improper* etc. [et ista similiter: Pater et Filius mittunt Spiritum sanctum; et haec est minus propria: Filius vel Spiritus sanctus mittit se, vel Spiritus sanctus mittit Filium; haec autem omnino impropria etc].

[2] As many manuscripts, such as A G H I K N T V X Y Z aa ee and ff and edition 1 require, we have inserted *He is* [est].

[3] The Vatican edition, contrary to nearly all the codices and edition 1, has not so distinctly *conveys a looking-back* [importat respectum]. A little below this after *manifestation* [manifestatio], in place of *of an emanation* [emanationis] very many codices together with editions 1, 2 and 3, put *of a mission* [missionis], which however corresponds less with the context.

[4] The Vatican edition together with edition 1 and one or the other codex has *similarly* [similiter], but badly, since it does not correspond with the objection.

[5] Here near the end of the response.

[6] We prefer the reading of not a few of the manuscripts, such as R T X Y and edition 1, of placing *so* [sic] for *similarly* [similiter], in place of which many codices, such as A C F G H I K L O S U W Z etc. have less aptly *just as* [sicut].

[7] Here, in the body (of the response).

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIV.

PARS I.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 267-269.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIV

PART I

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 267-269.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Dub. I.

In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa litteram, et primo dubitatur de hoc quod dicit, quod *Spiritus sanctus donatur non tantum a Patre et Filio, sed etiam datur a se ipso*. Videtur dicere falsum, quia supra[1] fecit argumentum, quod non potest dari a sanctis viris, quia non potest ab ipsis procedere; sed non potest a se ipso procedere: ergo pari ratione non potest dari a se.

Doubt I

In this part are the doubts about the text (of Master Peter), and first there is the doubt concerning this which he says, that *the Holy Spirit is granted not only by the Father and the Son, but is also given by Himself*. It seems that he says (something) false, because above[1] the argument was made, that He cannot be given by holy men, because He cannot proceed from them; but He cannot proceed from Him very self: therefore for an equal reason He cannot be given by Himself.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod Magister[2] arguebat de processione temporali, et de hac bene concedit ipse, quod procedit a se, eo quod propriae potestatis est, ut *spiret* in eum, in quem vult; sed sancti viri non habent posse in eum.[3]

I respond: It must be said, that Master (Peter)[2] argued concerning the temporal procession, and concerning this he well concedes, that He proceeds from Himself, for the reason that He has his own power [propriae potestatis est], to *spirate* into the one, into whom He wills; but holy men do not have power over Him [posse in eum].[3]

Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *donum Spiritus sancti nihil aliud est quam ipse Spiritus sanctus, sicut corpus carnis nihil aliud est quam caro*. Videtur enim, si

Doubt II

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that *the gift of the Holy Spirit is nothing other than the Holy Spirit Himself, just as a body of flesh is nothing other than flesh*. For it

similitudo bona est, ut omne quod est donum Spiritus sancti, sit Spiritus sanctus. *Sed contra*: timor[4] est donum Spiritus sancti, et non est Spiritus sanctus.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod donum, cum dicat[5] relationem ac per hoc quodam modo distinctionem, potest illam importare tripliciter: aut secundum modum *intelligendi*, aut secundum modum *essendi*, aut secundum *essentiam*. *Primo* modo *idem* est dans et datum, sicut « idem intelligens et intellectum »,[6] et *differens* ratione modi dicendi, quia datur idem a se; e sic intelligit Augustinus. *Alio* modo secundum modum *essendi* sive se habendi, qui alius est et alius in personis; et sic dicit relationem personae ad personam. *Tertio* modo importat distinctionem secundum *essentiam*, prout dicit effectum[7] et respectum creaturae ad essentiam increatam; et hoc modo timor dicitur donum Spiritus sancti; sed hoc infra melius patebit.[8]

seems, if the similitude is a good one, that everything which is a gift of the Holy Spirit, be the Holy Spirit. *But on the contrary*: the fear (of the Lord)[4] is a gift of the Holy Spirit, and is not the Holy Spirit.

I respond: It must be said, that "gift", when it means[5] a relation and through this a distinction in a certain manner, can convey that in a threefold manner: either according to a manner of *understanding*, or according to a manner of *being* [essendi], or according to *the essence*. In *the first* manner *the same* is giving and given, just as « the same understanding and understood »,[6] and *different* by reason of a manner of saying, because the same is given by itself; and in this manner does (St.) Augustine understand it. In *another* manner according to a manner of *being* or of regarding itself, because it is One and Another among the Persons; and in this manner it means a relation of Person to Person. In *a third* manner it conveys a distinction according to *essence*, insofar as it means an effect,[7] and the creature's looking-back to the Uncreated Essence; and in this manner the fear (of the Lord) is said (to be) a gift of the Holy Spirit; but this will be more clear below.[8]

Dub. III.

Item quaeritur de ratione Magistri, qua dicit: *Si Pater et Filius dant Spiritum sanctum, et Spiruts sanctus non dat se, aliquid potest Pater et Filius, quod non potest Spiritus sanctus*, quia ista ratio, ut supra dictum est,[9] non valet: Pater potest generare Filium, et Filius non potest: ergo Pater potest aliquid quod non potest Filius: ergo pari ratione, cum Spiritus sanctus dicat[10] personam ut Filuis, non valet. *Si tu dicas*, quod non est simile propter actum donandi,[11] qui est operatio in creatura; *contra*: sicut dicit Magister in littera,[12] Spiritus sancti donatio est eius processio, sed illud argumentum nihil valet: Spiritus sanctus procedit, et Pater non: ergo aliquid facit Spiritus sanctus, quod non Pater: ergo similiter nec in proposito. *Si tu dicas* mihi, quod non est simile de activa et passiva; *contra*: inflexio nominis per casus non variat significationem: ergo similiter videtur, quod nec ibi sit variatio per activum et passivum. *Et si tu dicas*, quod non est

Doubt III

Likewise is asked concerning the reckoning of Master (Peter), by which he says: *If the Father and the son give the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit does not give Himself, the Father and the Son can do something, which the Holy Spirit cannot*, because this reckoning of his, as has been said above,[9] is not valid: 'the Father can generate the Son, and the Son cannot: therefore the Father can do something which the Son cannot': therefore for an equal reason, since "Holy Spirit" means[10] a Person (just as much) as "Son" (does), its not valid. *If you say*, that it is not similar on account of the act of granting,[11] which is an operation in the creature: *on the contrary*: just as Master (Peter) says in the text,[12] the Holy Spirit's being-given is His procession, but that argument is valid for nothing: 'the Holy Spirit proceeds, and the Father (does) not: therefore the Holy Spirit does something, which the Father (does) not': therefore similarly neither in the proposed. *If you say*

simile; *ostenditur*, quod *sic*; quia omnis activa infert passivam: ergo videtur, quod si in voce activa tenetur[13] essentialiter, quod similiter in passiva.

to me, that it is not similar concerning an active and passive (action): *on the contrary*: the inflection of a noun through the cases does not vary (its) signification: therefore similarly it seems, that neither is there a variation through an active and passive (verb). *And if you say*, that it is not similar; *it is shown*, that (it is) *so*; because every active (action) infers the passive: therefore it seems, that if it is held[13] essentially in the active voice, that (it is held) similarly in the passive one.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod sicut praedeterminatum est,[14] rationes Magistri bonae sunt, quia ipse accipit *dare*, secundum quod dicit effectum in creatura; et secundum hoc commune est tribus personis necessario, et hoc in activa significatione. Dare enim Spiritum sanctum alicui est facere, quod inhabitet in eo; et ideo non est simile de potentia generandi.

I respond: It must be said, that just as has been predetermined,[14] the reasons of Master (Peter) are good, because he accepts *to give*, according to which it means an effect in the creature; and according to this it is common to the Three Persons necessarily, and this in an active signification. For “to give the Holy Spirit to someone” is “to cause Him to indwell in him”; and for that reason it is not similar concerning the power of generating.

At illud ergo[15] quod obiicitur, quod Magister dicit, quod donatio idem est quod processio; dicendum, quod loquitur de donatione passiva, secundum quod arctatur ad Spiritum sanctum; et argumentum suum bonum est, quia ab eodem principio est actio, et passio: ergo si donatio activa est a Patre, similiter donatio passiva; similiter si donatio activa est a Spiritu sancto, et passiva.

To that, therefore,[15] which is objected, because Master (Peter) says, that (His) being-given [donatio] is the same (thing) which (His) procession (is); it must be said, that he is peaking of passive donation, according to which it is constrained to the Holy Spirit; and his argument is good, because from the same principle the action is, (so) also the passion: therefore if the active donation is by the Father, similarly the passive donation; similarly if the active donation is by the Holy Spirit, (so) also the passive.

Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod in activa tenetur. . .

To that which is objected, that what is held in an active (action) . . .

---

[1] Dist. XIV. c. 3.
[2] Unus alterque codex ut ff cum ed. 1 addit *supra*.
[3] Cfr. hic lit. Magistri, c. 1 et q. 4.
[4] Cod. A *amor*.
[5] Ex antiquioribus mss. et edd. 1, 4, 5 substituimus *dicat* loco *dicit*.
[6] Aristot., III. de anima, text. 15. (ch. 4.). — Mox cod. dd *a se ipso* pro *a se*.
[7] Lectio mutila Vat., in qua omittitur *prout dicit effectum*, resarcitur ope mss. et ed. 1. Paulo infra, licet in nonnullis tantum mss. ut F T X dd habeatur, pro *amor* substituimus *timor*, utpote quod obiectioni magis respondet.
[8] Dist. 18. q. 2. et 5.
[9] Dist. 7. q. 2, et ibid. dub. 1.
[10] Vat. contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 *dicit*.
[11] Fide vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 posuimus *donandi* loco *dandi*.

[1] Distinction XIV, ch. 3.
[2] One or the other codex, such as ff, together with edition 1, inserts *above* [supra].
[3] Cf. here the text of Master (Peter), ch. 1, and q. 1.
[4] Codex A reads *love (of God)* [amor].
[5] From the more ancient manuscripts and editions 1, 4 and 5, we have substituted the subjunctive form for *it means* [dicat].
[6] Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. III, text 15 (ch. 4). — Then codex dd reads *by its very self* [a se ipso] for *by itself* [a se].
[7] The reading of the Vatican edition, in which there is omitted *insofar as it means an effect* [prout dicit effectum], is repaired with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1. A little below this, though it is had in not a few manuscripts, such as F T X and dd, we have substituted *the fear (of the Lord)* [timor] for *love (of the Lord)* [amor], as it

12 Hic, c. 1. — Mox ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *nihil* pro *non*.
13 Aliqui codd. ut S X Z *teneatur*.
14 Hic, q. 4, quae totam huius dubii solutionem magis explicat.
15 Ex mss. et ed. 1 restituimus particulam *ergo*.

corresponds more to the objection.
8 Distinction 18, qq. 2 and 5.
9 Distinction 7, q. 2, and dubium 1.
10 The Vatican edition, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, has *when"Holy Spirit" means* [cum . . . dicit].
11 Trusting in the older manuscripts and editin 1, we have put *of granting* [donandi] in place of *of giving* [dandi].
12 Here in ch. 1. — Then from very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *is valid for nothing* [nihil valet] for *not valid* [non valet].
13 Some codices, such as S X Z, have *it be held* [teneatur].
14 Here in q. 4, which better explains the entire solution to this doubt.
15 From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have restored the particle *therefore* [ergo].

---

essentialiter, ergo et in passiva, similiter ergo potest dici, quod Pater procedat; dicendum, quod argumentum istud non valet, quia spirare in voce activa convenit duobus, in voce passiva convenit uni soli; sic mittere potest convenire tribus, procedere vero sive mitti duobus tantum.

essentially, (is) therefore also (held essentially) in the passive, therefore similarly it can be said, that the Father proceeds; it must be said, that that argument is not valid, because "to spirate" in the active voice befits Two, in the passive voice it befits One alone; thus "to send" can befit Three, but "to proceed" or "to be sent" only Two.

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *Spiritus sanctus procedit a se*. Videtur enim falsum, quia *procedere* est *produci*: ergo si Spiritus sanctus procedit a se, producitur a se. *Si tu dicas*, quod non dicitur sine determinatione, videlicet *temporaliter*; contra: *temporaliter* est determinatio non diminuens: ergo sequitur de necessitate, si *temporaliter* procedit a se, quod *procedat* a se.

Doubt IV

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that *the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself*. For it seems false, that *to proceed* is *to be produced*: therefore if the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself, He is produced from Himself. *If you say*, that it is not said without a determination, namely *temporally*; on the contrary: *temporally* is a non-diminishing determination: therefore it follows of necessity, if He proceeds *temporally* from Himself, that He *proceeds* from Himself.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod sicut dictum est supra,[1] processio ratione comparationis ad terminum, in quo suscipitur, creatura scilicet quae sanctificatur, de ratione nominis connotat temporale, et ideo dicitur temporalis. Et quoniam ille effectus temporalis est a Spiritus sancto, ideo et processio, licet non ita proprie sicut de Patre. Nec[2] valet *de productione*, quia *productio* solum dicit comparationem ad *principium a quo* et non connotat effectum. Unde sicut non valet: procedit temporaliter, ergo producitur temporaliter, sic et in

I respond: It must be said, that as has been said above,[1] a procession by reason of (its) comparison to the terminus, in which it is taken-up, that is, the creature which is sanctified, from the reckoning of its name connotes (something) temporal, and for that reason is said (to be) temporal. And since that temporal effect is from the Holy Spirit, for that reason also (that) procession, although not so properly as (the one) from the Father. Nor[2] is it valid *of production*, because a *production* only means a comparison to the *principle from which* and

proposito.

it does not connote an effect. Whence just as: 'He proceeds temporally, therefore He is produced temporally' is not valid, so also (is it) in the proposed.

Dub. V.

Item quaeritur de probatione Magistri, qua probat missionem Spiritus sancti per missionem Filii, ibi: *Ne autem mireris, quod Spiritus sanctus dicitur mitti vel procedere a se. Nam et de Filio* etc. Videtur enim, quod male probet, quia missio dicit subauctoritatem in misso; sed plus est de subauctoritate in Spiritu sancto quam in Filio: ergo plus de ratione missionis: ergo videtur, quod potius deberet procedere e contrario.

Item, missio dicit manifestationem; sed mission Filii manifestata est per missionem Spiritus sancti: ergo manifestior est missio Spiritus sancti: ergo videtur, quod probet ignotum per ignotius.[3]

Iuxta hoc quaeritur, de quo proprius dicitur mitti, utrum[4] scilicet de Filio, an de Spiritus sancto?

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod Magister probat misionem Spiritus sancti per missionem Filii, quia magis expressas habet auctoritates ad hoc.[5] Potest tamen nihilominus dici, quod etiam ratiocinando bene procedit. In missione enim personae est duo considerare. scilicet *emanationem*, ratione cuius est subauctoritas in misso; et quantum ad hoc magis competit Spiritui sancto mitti,[6] et quantum ad hoc arguit Magister *a minori*: quod si Filius mittitur a Spiritus sancto et a se, multo fortius et Spiritus sanctus. Est etiam considerare *manifestationem*; et ratione huius magis convenit Filio, quia magis evidenter apparuit mundo, et quantum ad hoc arguit Magister *a manifestiori*;[7] et ita peroptime procedit.

Doubt V

Likewise is asked concerning the proof of Master (Peter), by which he proves the mission of the Holy Spirit through the mission of the Son, there (where he says): *But do not wonder, than the Holy Spirit is said to be sent and/or proceed from Himself. For even of the Son* etc.. For it seems, that he proves badly, because "mission" means "a subauthorship in the one sent"; but there is more concerning subauthorship in the Holy Spirit than in the Son: therefore more concerning the reckoning of mission: therefore it seems, that he ought rather to proceed contrariwise.

Likewise, "mission" means "a manifestation"; but the mission of the Son has been manifested through the mission of the Holy Spirit: therefore more manifest is the mission of the Holy Spirit: therefore it seems, that he proves the unknown through the more unkown.[3]

According to this, there is asked, concerning which "to be sent" is more properly said, whether[4] (it) namely concerns the Son, or whether (it) concerns the Holy Spirit.

I respond: It must be said, that Master (Peter) proves the mission of the Holy Spirit through the mission of the Son, because he has more express authorities for this.[5] Yet, nevertheless, it can be said, that he even proceeds by reasoning well. For in the mission of a Person there are two considerations [duo considerare]: that is, *emanation*, by reason of which there is subauthorship in the one sent; and as much as regards this it is more suitable [magis competit] to the Holy Spirit that He be sent;[6] and as much as regards this Master (Peter) argues *a minori*: because if the Son is sent by the Holy Spirit and by Himself, much more strongly also the Holy Spirit. And there is also the consideration of *manifestation*; and by reason of this it befits the Son more, because He has more evidently appeared to the world, and as much as regards this Master (Peter) argues *from the more manifest*:[7] and thus proceeds in the very best manner [peroptime].

Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Spiritus sanctus manifestat Filium et eius missionem; dicendum, quod hoc non est propter defectum evidentiae a parte missionis Filii, sed propter caecitatem a parte videntium, quam removet gratia Spiritus sancti.

To that which is objected, that the Holy Spirit manifests the Son and His mission; it must be said, that this is not on account of a defect of evidence on the part of the mission of the Son, but on account of the blindness on the part of the ones seeing, which (blindness) the grace of the Holy Spirit removes.

Et sic patet, de quo proprius.[8] Uno enim modo magis competit Filio, alio modo magis Spiritui sancto secundum duas praedictas conditiones.

And thus it is clear, concerning which (is) more proper.[8] For in one manner it is more suitable to the Son, in another manner more to the Holy Spirit according to the two aforesaid conditions.

Dub. VI.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Ostendit eo Filium missum, quo factum ex mulier*: quia secundum hoc, cum Spiritus sanctus non sit factus ex mulier, videtur quod non sit missus. *Praeterea*, si Filius[9] est *factus ex muliere*, ergo est factus. *Contra*: in Symbolo:[10] *Non factus*.

Doubt VI

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *He shows that the Son (has been) sent for the reason that (He has been) made from a woman*: because according to this, since the Holy Spirit has not been made from a woman, it seems that He has not been sent. *Moreover*, if the Son[9] has been *made from a woman*, therefore He has been made. *On the contrary*: (it is said) in the Creed:[10] *Not made*.

Respondeo: Ista non est communis ratio missionis, sed solum missionis visibilis ipius Filii, et ideo non valet de Spiritu sancto.[11]

I respond: That is not a common reckoning of mission, but only of the visible mission of the Son Himself, and for that reason it is not valid concerning the Holy Spirit.[11]

---

[1] Dist. 14. a. 1. q. 1, et hic q. 2. — Mox ed. 1 *creaturam* pro *creatura*.
[2] Vat. cum cod. cc *Et non* loco *Nec*. Mox post *quo* aliqui codd. ut A G T W Z bb cc cum ed. 1 omittunt *et*, aliqui vero ut F H I dd ponunt *nec* pro *et non*.
[3] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et sex primarum edd. et minus bene *ignotum*.
[4] In Vat. et cod. cc omittitur *utrum*, quod tamen in aliis codd. et ed. 1 habetur. Nonnulla scripta ut U Y cum ed. 1 paulo ante *per prius* loco *proprus*, sed falso, sicut ex responsione patet.
[5] Exhibemus lectionem maioris partis codd. ut A G H I M O T V W X aa bb etc. et ed. 1, dum Vat. cum aliquibus codd., interpunctione mutata, male habet *auctoritates*. *Adhuc post.* Mox post *nihilominus* lectione codd. variant, alii codd. ut H O T Y Z ff cum ed. 1 exhibent nostram, alii addunt cum Vat. *alio modo*, alii ut A S Q perperam *nullo modo*, cod. I *nonnullo modo*.
[6] Vat. contra multos codd. et ed. 1 *convenit* pro *competit*, quae et dein, mutata interpunctione, ponit *Spiritum sanctum mitti*, sed nostram lectionem exhibent explicite multi codd. cum ed. 1; aliqui propter abbreviationem dubiae sunt lectionis. Paulo post *multo fortius et* cod. I addit *a se*, dum cod. dd habet *multo fortius Spiritus sanctus mittitur a se*.
[7] In mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 *minori* pro *manifestiori*, sed falso. Cod. dd ultimas propositiones ita exhibet: *Est etiam considerare manifestationem apparentis, et*

[1] Distinction 14, a. 1, q. 1, and here in q. 2. — Then edition 1 has *(to) the creature* [creaturam] for *the creature* [creatura].
[2] The Vatican edition together with codex cc has *And not* [Et non] for *Nor* [Nec]. Then after *from which* [a quo] some codices, such as A G T W Z bb and cc, together with edition 1, omit *and* [et], but others, such as F H I and dd, put *nor* for *and . . . not* [et non].
[3] The Vatican edition without the authority of the manuscripts and the six first editions, and less well, has *through the unknown* [per ignotum].
[4] In the Vatican edition and codex cc, there is omitted *whether* [utrum], which however is had in the other codices and edition 1. Not a few texts, such as U Y together with edition 1, a little before have *through (a consideration of what is) prior* [per prius] in place of *more properly* [proprius], but falsely, as is clear from the response.
[5] We exhibit the reading of the greater part of the codices, such as A G H I M O T V W X aa bb etc., and edition 1, while the Vatican edition together with the other codices, with changed punctuation, has badly: *authorities. Still after*. [auctoritates. Adhuc post.] Then after *nevertheless* the codices vary in reading; some codices, such as H O T Y Z ff, together with edition 1, exhibit our reading, others add together with the Vatican edition *in some manner* [alio modo], some, such as A S Q faultily have *in no manner* [nullo modo], codex I has *in some manner* [nonnullo modo].

ratione huius magis convenit Filio, quia apparuit benignitas Filii evidenter mundo in unione carnis, et quantum ad hoc arguit Magister a manifestiori et taliter peroptime procedit. Et per hoc patet ad primum obiectum. Ad illud quod secundo obiicitur etc.

[8] Vat. sibi non constans et contra plurimos codd. nec non ed. 1 *prius*; pauci codd. *per prius*, quod tamen cum subnexis minus convenit. Cod. dd. *Sic etiam patet, de quo proprius dicatur missio*. Mox post *alio modo* ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *magis*.

[9] In cod. W additur *Dei*.

[10] Vat., obnitentibus mss. et sex primis edd., *per Symbolum*.

[11] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 *se* pro *Spiritu sancto*.

[6] The Vatican edition, contrary to many codices and to edition 1, has *it is more fitting* [magis convenit], which also after, with changed punctuation, puts *that the Holy Spirit be sent* [Spiritum sanctum mitti], but our reading is exhibited explicitly by many codices, together with edition 1; some on account of abbreviation are of a dubious reading. A little after *much more strongly also* [multo fortius et] codex I adds *by Himself* [a se], while codex dd has *much more strongly is the Holy Spirit sent by Himself* [multo fortius Spiritus sanctus mittitur a se].

[7] In the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, there is had *a minori* for *from the more manifest* [a manifestiori], but falsely. Codex dd exhibits the final propositions thus: *There is also the consideration of the manifestation of the one appearing, and by reason of this it befits the Son more, that the kindness of the Son has appeared evidently to the world in the union of the flesh, and as much as regard this Master (Peter) argued from the more manifest and in such a wise proceeds in the very best manner. And through this is it clear regarding the first objection. To that which is objected second* etc.. [Est etiam considerare manifestationem apparentis, et ratione huius magis convenit Filio, quia apparuit benignitas Filii evidenter mundo in unione carnis, et quantum ad hoc arguit Magister a manifestiori et taliter peroptime procedit. Et per hoc patet ad primum obiectum. Ad illud quod secundo obiicitur etc.]

[8] The Vatican edition, non consistent with itself and contrary to very many codices and also to edition 1, has *prior* [prius]; a few codices read *through (a consideration of what is) prior* [per prius], which however is less fitting with the subjoined. Codex dd has *Thus it is also clear, concerning which is more properly said "mission"* [Sic etiam patet, de quo proprius dicatur missio].

[9] In codex W there is added *of God* [Dei].

[10] The Vatican edition, with the manuscripts and the six first editions fighting against it, has *through the Creed* [per Symbolum].

[11] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, has *Himself* [se] for *the Holy Spirit* [Spiritu sancto].

---

p. 269

Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod est *factus*;[1] dicendum, quod illud est intelligendum secundum humanam naturam; et ideo oportet addere determinationem, ut dicatur factus *ex muliere*, vel *secundum humanam naturam*, quia simpliciter propter errorem Arii vitandum non recipit eam[2] eloquium ecclesiasticum.

To that which is objected, that He has been *made*;[1] it must be said, that that must be understood according to the human nature, and for that reason one is bound to add a determination, as (when) there is said "made *out of a woman*" and/or "*according to the human nature*", because on account of avoiding the error of Arius the speech of the Church does not receive it,[2] simply (speaking).

[1] Errorem, qui in mss. et edd. irrepsit, scil. post *quod* addendo *non*, quique ortus esse videtur ex permutatione ultimae obiectionis cum propositione

[1] The error, which has crept into the manuscripts and editions, namely, by adding *not* [non] after *that He has* [quod], which seems to have arisen from the

post *Contra*, emendavimus eliminando particulam *non*, quae etiam in cod. H expuncta conspicitur. Idem dubium recurrit III. Sent. d. 1. dub. 2, ex quo emendatio a nobis facta comprobatur. Cod. I legendo *non factus* paulo infra ponit *divinam* pro *humanam*, sed cum subnexis incohaerenter. Vat. *non est intelligendum nisi* loco *est intelligendum*, sed absque fide mss. et ed. 1. — Cod. cc cum ed. 2 retinet *non*, sed omittit *nisi*, at contra subnexa.

[2] Nempe propositionem, quae est: *Filius est factus*.

permutation of the last objection with the proposition which comes after *On the contrary* [Contra], we have emended by eliminating the particle *not* [non], which has also conspicuously been expunged in codex H. Likewise this doubt recurs in Sent., Bk. III, d. 1, dubium 2, wherein our emendation here is confirmed. Codex I by reading *not made* [non factus] a little below this, puts *divine* [divinam] in place of *human* [humanam], but in a manner incoherent with what is subjoined. The Vatican edition reads *that it is not to be understood except* [non est intelligendum nisi] in place of *must be understood* [est intelligendum], but without the testimony of the manuscripts and edition 1, — Codex cc together with edition 2 retains the *not* [non], but omits the *except* [nisi], but contrary to what follows.

[2] Namely the proposition, which is: *The Son was made* [Filius est factus].
